

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1857.

ART. I.—IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND.

First Impressions of England and its People. By *Hugh Miller*. Edinburgh and Boston. 1851.

De l'Avenir Politique de l'Angleterre. Par le *Comte de Montalembert*. Translated from the French. London. 1855.

English Traits. By *R. U. Emerson*. Boston. 1856.

AN American can hardly approach the shores of old England without a deep pulsation of heart. As he walks through her cities and villages; as he hears the familiar sounds of his native tongue, more musical to him than "Tuscan softness or Castilian majesty"; as he converses at the fire-side, and listens to a speech in the court house, or to a sermon from the messenger of God, he feels the charm of sweet associations of home and kindred. His first love and duty belong to his mother, the Anglo-Saxon republic of the West. But this should not prevent him from paying due homage to that venerable and still vigorous grandmother, who gave birth to the Pilgrim Fathers of the Bay State, and the cavaliers of the Old Dominion. Our country is made up, indeed, of all the nations of Europe, and seems destined, on that account, to produce a nationality still more comprehensive and cosmopolitan than even that of Great Britain. But the stem of the American people is the noblest shoot of the royal oak of England, and it will never deny the Anglo-Saxon type, though it should ultimately far outgrow the parent tree.

It is true, there is a great deal of prejudice, envy and jealousy between the two nations, arising from, and nourished by, the oppressions which drove many of our first ancestors from their native home, and followed them even to their adopted country; the declaration and the war of independence, which broke forever the bond of governmental union; the war of 1812, and the burning of our capitol by the British; the annual annihilations of George III. by our fourth of July orators; the large infusion of Irish antipathy and bigotry in our population; the illiberal, haughty and contemptuous tone of many English tourists; and the vain boasting and filibustering spirit of Young America. It vents itself from time to time, not only in English and American newspapers and books of travel, but finds its way occasionally even into the dignified halls of Parliament, and Congress. But this jealousy is owing to the very affinity of the two nations, and the natural rivalry of two ambitious governments, each striving for the supremacy of the seas; just as the diplomatic friendship of America and Russia arises from the great distance and the improbability of a collision of their widely distinct interests. No amount of political prejudice can destroy the fact of the essential identity of language, laws, customs and religion, which makes itself felt even in the midst of strife; and the warlike propensities and barbarous love of conquest, must yield, we trust, more and more to the nobler rivalry in the arts of peace, and the pursuit of the common mission of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Lord Clarendon has, after all, expressed the deeper sentiment of all classes of intelligent Englishmen, when he declared, in an official dispatch on the recent enlistment-difficulty, "There are no two countries which are bound by stronger ties and by higher considerations, than the United States and Great Britain, to maintain unbroken the relations of perfect cordiality and friendship." On the other hand, at this very time, when the two governments were snarling at each other, the genuine American feeling towards England found the truest and noblest exponent in

the person of the late Dr. Kane, who in the blended interests of humanity and science, started a second time, in search of Sir John Franklin, to the eternal winter of the Arctic regions, there to fight, "Titan-like, with unchecked nature, with bewildered ice and maddening cold, in a long blind winter and brief blinding summer," and who brought back the fatal disease, but also the immortal record of his heroic adventures and an unmelting crown of icy diamonds, conceded to him as cheerfully and gratefully by England as by his own countrymen.*

As Great Britain may point with the pride of a mother to the United States as her full grown daughter, who rules the destinies of the Western world: so the Americans need not be ashamed of their descent from that remarkable island which gave birth to a Shakspeare and Milton, a Bacon and Newton, a Baxter and Leighton, a Burke and Canning, a Nelson and Wellington, a Howard and Wilberforce; and should rejoice to be the chief heirs of that race which stands at the head of modern nations and carries along with its commerce, the blessings of Christian civilization and constitutional freedom to the ends of the earth.

The present power and greatness of Albion is one of the wonders of the age. That an island, naturally fertile, rich and well fortified, but comparatively small, beaten by the tempest, shrouded in eternal vapors and deemed once beyond the reach of civilization, should attain to the highest eminence in wealth, science and arts, and become the queen of the seas and the ruler over more than eight millions of square miles and two hundred millions of people, stretch-

* The U. S. Consul at Portsmouth, at the recent delivery of the "Resolute," has in a humorous way given a good lesson to the martial fire-eaters of both countries by paraphrasing the well known hymn of children:

Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
For God hath made them so;
Let Turks and Russians growl and fight,
For 'tis their nature too.
But Anglo-Saxons should not let
Their angry passions rise;
Their great big hands were never made
To tear each others eyes.

ing out its arms from Europe to Asia, Africa, America, and Australia, encircling the globe, and planting the seeds of new empires in the ancient East and the youthful West, in the icy North and the burning South : this is a phenomenon to which the annals of history hardly furnish a parallel. Neither Tyre and Sidon with their extensive commerce and wealth ; nor Carthage, the land of Hannibal and rival of Rome ; nor Rome herself in the height of her glory when her imperial sceptre extended from the banks of the Euphrates to the columns of Hercules, and from the plains of the Nile to the hills of the Rhine ; neither Spain in her proudest days when " the sun never set upon her dominions ;" nor France under the first empire, when the half of Europe paid reluctant homage to the modern Cæsar ; nor even Russia with her almost boundless territorial possessions stretching over more than half the circuit of the globe, presents a spectacle so sublime and commanding as the power of England, especially if we consider the fact that it rests not in brute force, but mainly in the intellectual and moral superiority of her people, and the solid worth of her institutions. Innumerable vessels start annually from her ports to return in due time with the treasures of every nation and clime. Fifty thousand of her sons alone control one hundred and fifty millions of Hindoos. Her cannons burst the walls of China and bring one third of the human race in contact with the Christian world. Her industry and commerce supply the markets of both hemispheres. Her literature, institutions and example act with growing power among the civilized nations in favor of liberty, virtue and religion. Her missionaries, Bibles and Tracts go forth to all heathen lands and prepare the way for the last and greatest triumphs of the Gospel of peace.

Nor is there any just ground for the expectation that the English nation has already passed the zenith of her greatness. In 1854 I heard Prince Metternich give it as his deliberate opinion that England would soon pass through a radical social revolution, as France did in 1789. But the

fact that it steered unshaken through the continental crisis of 1830 and 1848, justifies a very different view from the one entertained by the veteran statesman of Austria. England understands the art to avoid a revolution by orderly constitutional reform. It reveres the past, and yet keeps pace with the progress of the age. Its people could gain nothing by a violent convulsion which they cannot gain more surely and better by parliamentary legislation. A foreigner is apt to be misled by the tone of the English press, especially during elections and at critical periods, when every abuse is dragged to the light and most mercifully exposed. The Englishman, and the American too, reserves to himself the privilege of grumbling and finding fault with his government and institutions which he would allow to no outsider. But the very boldness and fearless independence of the British and American press betray a feeling of ease and security as to the foundations of society. People who live in impregnable fortresses can afford occasionally to throw stones at each other.

To give a faithful description of the English nation and its institutions, is felt to be more difficult at each successive visit. We can readily understand why Baron Burlew, formerly Prussian ambassador at London, after three years residence in England, thought it impossible to write a book about it, which he intended to write after a residence of three weeks, but which he felt to become more difficult the longer he observed the country. For England is not like an artificial garden of Versailles or St. Cloud, laid out in symmetrical order, straight promenades, regular alleys, adorned by playing fountains, well trimmed trees and rounded hedges, which you can measure with a glance of the eye; but like one of nature's landscapes, presenting, in gradual succession and irregular beauty, charming lawns and impenetrable thickets, fresh meadows and rocky hills, majestic oaks and entangled shrubbery, romantic lakes and abominable quagmires,—but abounding wherever you look, in spontaneous vigorous life.

A general idea of the outside of the country can now be

obtained in a few days. For England is a complete net of rail-roads, whose solidity and safety contrasts strangely with our own. Less accidents happen there in one year than with us in one month, or perhaps one week. A return to the Board of Trade, as quoted by Mr. Lowe in the House of Commons, shows that in 1854 the number of persons carried by rail-road on the British isles was one hundred and fourteen millions, of persons killed twelve, and injured three hundred and thirty one; in 1855 there were carried one hundred and eighteen millions, killed ten, injured 311; in 1856 carried one hundred and twenty five millions, killed eight, and injured 282.

If you wish to see modern Britain with its commerce and manufactures, its noise and bustle, its energy and enterprise, its avarice and generosity, its din and smoke, its wealth and squalor, its splendor and misery, you must go to such cities as Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield and Hull. If you prefer to go back to the England of Shakspeare and the days of chivalry and romance, you will find it still in living beauty on the walls and in the cathedrals of Chester and York, on the meadows and in the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, in the castles of Windsor and Warwick, the ruins of Kennilworth and Melrose. And if you desire to see the stirring life of the present moving on the graveyard and among the monuments of the past, you can satisfy your heart's content in Edinburg and Glasgow, and especially in London, with its Westminster Abbey, and St. Paul's, its Tower, and New Houses of Parliament, its Museum and Bank, its Guildhall and Tunnel, its Buckingham palace and Billingsgate market, its crowded streets and airy parks, its luxury and wretchedness, its virtue and vice, and

"That mighty mass of brick, and smoke and shipping,
Dirty, and dusky, but as wide as eye
Can reach, with here and there a sail just skipping
In sight, then lost amidst the forestry
Of masts; a wilderness of steeples peeping
On tiptoe through their sea-coral canopy."

What a monster city is this London! Yea, I should rather

say an empire stretching some six miles in every direction from Temple Bar or Charing Cross, and gathering within these limits more inhabitants, (now approaching fast to three millions) more wealth, trade, intellectual and moral power, more happiness and misery than many principalities and kingdoms. It is the metropolis of commerce, the great beating heart whose pulsations are felt and obeyed in the East and West Indies, in Canada and Australasia, in Brazil and China.

But we do not intend, of course, to enter into a geographical and archaeological description of that remarkable island, which realizes on a grand scale Homer's description of the shield of Achilles:

"Now, the broad shield complete, the artist crowned
With his last hand, and poured the ocean round,
In living silver seemed the waves to roll,
And beat the buckler's verge, and crown the whole."

Our object is rather to exhibit, in general outlines, the religious, social, and political character of the English nation as it underlies and explains its present commanding position and world-wide influence.

The eloquent French Count Montalembert, in his interesting work on the "Political Future of England" draws a parallel between Spain and England such as they were in the sixteenth and such as they are in the eighteenth century. Spain, once the first Christian nation, he says, is now "nothing! All is gone. Institutions, politics, riches, credit, influence, army, navy, commerce, industry, science, literature—all simultaneously vanished"; while England, during the same period, has "advanced from greatness to greatness and disputes with France the first place in the affairs of the world." The Roman Catholic Count calls it blasphemy to trace the greatness of England to its Protestantism, and the decline of Spain to its Romanism, and accounts for the striking contrast simply by the political liberty of the former, and the political despotism of the latter. We accept the facts as substantially true, but we reject the conclusions as supremely unphilosophi-

cal and superficial. A similar parallel might be drawn between Scotland and Italy, Holland and Portugal, the Northern and the Southern portions of Ireland, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, and between the United States and the Central and South American Republics, and in each case we would be forced to go back to religion as the deepest cause of the rise and fall, the prosperity and adversity of nations. For it is as true now as in the days of David and Solomon, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, and sin is a reproach to any people." Political freedom is no doubt one of the greatest blessings, as despotism is one of the greatest curses of a nation. But if we ask what enabled England to maintain and extend her liberty, and what keeps up and nourishes despotism in Spain, as well as in Rome, Naples, Portugal, Austria, and nearly every Papal country on the globe, the natural and only possible answer is to be found in what Montalembert, blinded by his religious prejudices, calls blasphemy. We readily admit that the Catholic Church was the mother of European civilization and national progress from the downfall of the Roman Empire to the beginning of the sixteenth century. But since that time the process of development has been mainly carried on by the Protestant type of Christianity. It is a fact, which no amount of sophistry can set aside, that the decline of Spain and Italy, as well as the rise of Holland and England date from the rejection of the Reformation by the former, and its embrace by the latter. This coincidence is not accidental, but reveals the close and natural connection of Protestantism with civil freedom, national prosperity, and social progress. England is the strongest bulwark of Protestantism, against which the proud waves of Rome cannot prevail.

The English were an earnest and religious people from the days of the venerable Bede and Alfred the Great, and it would be unjust to deny the great merits of Catholicism which converted them to Christianity and developed their energies during the long course of the Middle Ages. But

it is certain that the Reformation acted as a most powerful stimulus upon English piety and gave it its present shape and form.

And here we must specify first the rich diffusion of the Word of God among all classes of society in England and Scotland. There the Bible is interwoven with the inmost life and history of the nation. There it has become as familiar as household words, and enjoys a reverence and popularity as in no other country under the sun, the United States alone perhaps excepted. Much of this is due to the admirable translation, one of the best, if not the very best, ever made, and one, too, which is baptized in the blood and sacrifices of many martyrs. I cannot refrain from quoting here a remarkable eulogy recently pronounced upon it by an enemy, the learned Dr. Newman, the intellectual father of Tractarianism, who saw fit in a strange delusion to exchange the Anglican for the Roman Catholic communion. "Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear, like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. . . . The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft and gentle, and pure and penitent and good, speaks to him forever out of his English Bible. . . . It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible." (See *Dublin Review*, June, 1853.)

Another element of strength and national prosperity to

England and Scotland, is the strict observance of Sunday, which obtained there since the seventeenth century, and which America likewise inherited as an invaluable legacy. The continent of Europe, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, has nothing like it. Every body knows that there the Lord's day is most shockingly profaned and turned into a day of secular amusement and sinful dissipation. Say what you please, the English and American Sabbath is a powerful support of public virtue and piety, a heavenly rest amidst the unrest of earth, a weekly foretaste of the Saints' everlasting rest, a constant exercise of self-collection and self-control, and hence a pillar also of rational freedom and popular government.

Closely connected with this is the ennobling, purifying and sanctifying power of the pulpit, which is nowhere greater than in the British islands, and exceeds the combined influence of human learning, eloquence and art. The Bible, the Sunday and the Pulpit go hand in hand and depend upon each other. Let us hear also on this topic an English authority. The "London Quarterly Review," in a recent article on the Pulpit and its influence, makes the following just remarks which are equally applicable to our own country: "We suppose that it is scarcely possible to overrate the public and social interests which depend upon the sacred institute of preaching. So long as the people of these islands continue to be distinguished by their strict observance of the Sabbath day, so long will the educational influence of the pulpit remain paramount in Britain. Whether we consider the momentous character of the truths which are there asserted and enforced; the number of persons and variety of classes who, by any motive, are brought within their hearing; the regularity, and frequency, and power with which they are proclaimed; or the intimate manner in which the truths themselves are calculated to affect the convictions and the lives of men, we shall find in each consideration a far more than sufficient reason for cherishing a deep concern in the right direction of this great moral power. It is much, and yet it

is little, to say, that all the teaching of the schools and universities of our country exerts no influence upon the chief elements of society at all comparable to the influence of the Christian ministry. The very basis both of national and individual character has long been formed, as it will long continue to be, by those weekly religious services which no wise man is lofty enough to despise, and no child too simple to profit by; and though the instruction is for the most part purely Scriptural and moral, yet perhaps a larger amount of knowledge, intellectual enjoyment, and other elements of sound education, are imparted to a vast proportion of the community by these means than by all the other means put together. . . . The pulpit is the great barrier which mainly resists the influence of an active irreligious press. While no mean proportion of our literature is sanctified to the highest purposes of human life, it cannot be denied that a still more influential portion is imbued with a worldly and unchristian spirit. It is the pulpit which most effectually keeps the press in check, which leavens the whole mass of public opinion, which gives to virtue the order of divine authority, and to morality the sanction of a holy law. How many of the blessings of this great empire are due to the religious principles which—in greater or less degree—restrain, direct, and prompt its individual energies, will never be known till the great day of God; but if it be asked, by what means these religious principles have been rooted and extended in the nation, there is but one answer to be given—this is instrumentally due to the popular and habitual observance of the Christian Sabbath, to the practice of public worship, and the ‘foolishness of preaching.’ ”

If we attribute the greatness of England mainly to the Protestant religion, and more particularly to the influence of the Bible, the Sabbath and the pulpit, we must, of course, not confine ourselves to the two ecclesiastical establishments, the Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but make due account of all the various branches of Dissent, especially the

Independents, the Methodists, and the Presbyterian secession bodies, of which the Free Church is the most recent, but the most active and influential. It is a strange fact that the English Reformation, though far less noble and spiritual in its origin, than the Continental, especially if we look to that royal despot, whose sinful passion for the mother of Elizabeth was its first *external* occasion, has yet had a deeper and more lasting effect upon the people, than the corresponding movement in Germany, Switzerland, or France. It is in England and Scotland alone, and in their offspring, the United States, where Protestantism has fully developed itself, not only as a religious and theological, but also as a social and political principle, and that under a truly national form.

To account for this fact we must keep in mind that the English Reformation was by no means completed in the sixteenth century, but was carried on by the Puritan revolution in the seventeenth, the Methodist revival in the eighteenth, and the Evangelical movement in the nineteenth centuries, each of which left its deep and lasting marks also upon the established Church, roused it from its slumber, purged it of many abuses, and proved thus of the greatest benefit to it. The great struggles of the various forms of Dissent with the ruling power, especially during the seventeenth century, called out all the mental and moral energies of the nation and resulted in the gradual abolition of the penal laws in matters of conscience, and the triumph of those great principles of religious and political freedom, by which it is so highly favored above all the nations of the old world.

Great Britain still maintains, it is true, two ecclesiastical establishments, Episcopacy in England, and Presbyterianism in Scotland, and forms thus the transition from the Continent of Europe where dissent is allowed only to a limited extent and by special concessions of the Government, and between the United States where the church is entirely separated from the civil power, and where all religious denominations are placed on a basis of perfect equality before the law. As the English are noted for the tena-

city with which they adhere to long established customs and even old family abuses, it is not likely that the union of Church and State will be entirely broken up, at least not for a long time to come. It is well enough that such a time-honored connection should only gradually be loosened as the wants of the age seem to demand. Radical measures always produce a reaction and do more harm in the end than good. Washington Irving humorously says: "To keep up his chapel, has cost John Bull much money; but he is staunch in his religion, and piqued in his zeal, from the circumstance that many dissenting chapels have been erected in his vicinity, and several of his neighbors, with whom he has had quarrels, are strong papists."

But in point of fact the Dissenters in England and Scotland, according to the Census Report published at London in 1854, are numerically stronger now, than the two established Churches, which hardly keep pace with the growing religious wants of the population, especially among the laboring classes of society. They enjoy at present unrestricted freedom of worship, and for their loss of the temporal support of government they may feel amply compensated by their independence of State control and interference to which both the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland are subject. Moreover the tendency of the age is evidently to weaken still more the bond of union between the temporal and spiritual power, and it may not be long perhaps till even Jews will be admitted to Parliament, whose doors, since the abolition of the Test Act, have been thrown open already to Roman Catholics and Unitarians. By this mixed character of the legislative council in which the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown virtually resides, the union of Church and State becomes more and more a glaring inconsistency. The same government which was once purely Episcopalian, now finds it necessary not only to support Romanism in Ireland by the Maynooth grant, but even Buddhism and Mohammedanism in India. The supreme council of India actually paid £2,500 annually for the idolatry of Juggernaut till quite recently when they

discharged all the claims by settling upon it a permanent endowment sufficient to produce \$7,500 a year. The entire separation of such a hypocritical connection would perhaps be better for the spiritual benefit of the Church of England. For she would still remain the central framework of Protestantism in Great Britain and her dependencies, but acquire, at the same time, the right of self-government and independence of action; she could then develop all her internal resources, and by speaking more in love than by authority, and presenting herself as the messenger of God more than as the agent of the State, she would engage to a larger extent the affection of the people. We would hear no more of fox hunting lord-bishops, of non-residence, plurality of benefices, and other crying evils, which were most complained of in the days of her unlimited power; and the ranks of indifferent clergymen of the "high and dry," and of the "low and slow" order, would be filled with laborious, self-denying, devoted servants of Christ. The present condition of the dissenting bodies of England and Scotland, the Episcopal communion of Scotland, as all the Churches of this country, as well as the history of the first three centuries, sufficiently prove that Christianity can get along on the voluntary principle without the temporal support of the civil government.

Yet, we should not forget, on the other hand, the many advantages of the State-Church system, and the large amount of good which a government like the English can do for the advancement of Christianity in the distant colonies over which it is providentially called to rule. In this respect the importance and duty of that mighty nation can hardly be overrated. The English are emphatically the missionary nation of the present age, and no Christian who has the triumph of his holy religion at heart, can wish their downfall, as long as they protect the messengers of the Cross in all their colonies. We Americans should never ungratefully forget that the Northern part of this great country has been gained to the Kingdom of Christ mainly through the early settlers who brought from Eng-

land and Scotland the Christian faith as their dearest treasure to the bleak hills of New England, and the banks of the Potomac. A similar process is now going on in all the immense dependencies of that people. We may justly censure the grasping disposition of the British government and its selfish commercial policy to which every other interest is made to bend. But we should not overlook, on that account, the missionary zeal and activity of the British Churches who keep step with the conquests of the government and labor to make them subservient to the progress of Christian civilization. They contribute more means annually for the spread of the Bible and the Gospel in foreign lands than probably the whole Continent of Europe, Catholic and Protestant combined. Even during the recent Russian war the activity in that direction has rather increased than decreased, and will continue to do so, we trust, for many years to come. Wherever the English rule extends, and wherever the English language is spoken, there the Gospel is preached, the Bible read, the school established, religious and civil liberty planted. One of the most striking features of modern history is the rapid rise of colonies and the springing up of new empires in America, Africa, East India, and the South Sea Islands, under the guiding star of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the Protestant religion. The propagation of Christianity and civilization under its evangelical form is mainly entrusted by Providence to Great Britain and the United States, and this is the highest motive that should prompt them ever to live on terms of sincere friendship and honorable rivalry of peaceful progress.

We next proceed to an analysis of the intellectual and moral character of the English.

To understand this properly, we must take into consideration first the insular isolation, as one of the chief physical causes of their national traits and present position. For while it afforded them opportunities of ready commerce with all the shores of the civilized world, and of accumulating an enormous mass of wealth, it protected

them at the same time from foreign invasion, and was most favorable to the development of home-life and that power of self-government which qualifies them both for the rational enjoyment of liberty at home, and the control of the vast empires abroad.

In the next place we must remember that the English are a mixed race, to which the Romanized Briton, the Anglo-Saxon or German, the Dane, and the Frenchified Norman contributed their share. These elements were not so antagonistic as to refuse an intermarriage, or by intermarriage to deteriorate and degenerate, as is the case with the mixture of the Spaniard, the Indian and the Negro in the South American countries; yet they were different enough to produce a new race that should combine the peculiar energies of all. After long remaining hostile to each other, they coalesced, since the twelfth or thirteenth century, under the influence of Christianity, first Catholic and then Protestant, into an organic unity; the Saxon forming the material foundation, and the Norman the vitalizing soul. To this mixture of different, yet cognate nationalities, must be attributed the peculiar strength and expansiveness of the English character. For

"Where gentleness with force we find,
The tender with the stern combined,
The harmony is sweet and strong."

The English excel not so much in showy, as in solid qualities. Their worth lies more in the deep than on the surface. They are not so well calculated to gain your affections, as to command your admiration. Their apparent or real haughtiness, coldness and taciturnity are apt to repel at first, and their eccentricities and splenetic habits, especially when travelling abroad, may provoke a smile. But they gain upon acquaintance, and their manliness, and sincerity, their truthfulness and reliability, their sense of rectitude, and love of plain dealing and fair play, their benevolence and generosity, their intellectual and moral substantiality will secure ultimately your lasting esteem. The English mind is neither as idealistic, contemplative, and

patiently inquisitive as the German, nor as quick, versatile and brilliant as the French; but surpasses them both in that strong sterling good sense which enables it to understand the concrete realities of life, to deal with things as they are, and not as they might be, to engage in any kind of business and to turn everything to proper account.

With this is connected a directness of purpose, a straight-forward single-mindedness, and a power of cool observation which implies real curiosity, but an entire absence of wonder. This trait makes the *nil admirari* a maxim of good breeding, and forbids the Englishman to be charmed with music, to laugh at comedy, to weep at tragedy and to show strong symptoms of joy or grief in the sudden reverses of prosperity and adversity. He smiles at ecstasy and enthusiasm as a species of weakness. But for this very reason he has also a keen sense of whatever is ridiculous.

Quiet, deep, good natured humor is as characteristic of "merry" England, as sprightly, dashing, sparkling wit and *esprit* is at home in the gay society and light literature of France. Humor is more an attribute of the heart and rests on an earnest sense of the vanities and follies of man, "that pendulum betwixt a smile and tear;" wit is an effulgence of the imagination and flows from a keen perception of the strange contradictions and remote analogies of things, and the conviction that man—to use an expression of Pascal—is at once "the guardian of truth, and a mere huddle of uncertainty, the glory, and the scandal of the universe." Wit aims only at others, while humor spares not itself. Washington Irving in his *Sketch Book*, remarks: "It is characteristic of the peculiar humor of the English and of their love for what is blunt, comic, and familiar, that they have embodied their national oddities in the figure of a sturdy, corpulent old fellow, with a three-cornered hat, red waistcoat, leather breeches, and stout oaken cudgel. Thus they have taken a singular delight in exhibiting their most private foibles in a laughable point of view, and have been so successful in delineations, that

there is scarcely a being in actual existence more absolutely present to the public mind, than that eccentric personage, John Bull."

In a practical point of view, the English have no superior among the nations of the earth, in calm self-possession, dignified reserve, courage and patient endurance. In them the iron strength of the ancient Romans, and the stern severity of Stoicism are revived, but under a nobler and purer form. Massive strength and solidity characterizes all their works, the docks of Liverpool, and the fortress of Gibraltar, their rail-roads and steam-boats, their splendidly bound books and domestic comforts.

British energy is not impulsive, fiery, aggressive as the French, but sober, calculating, tenacious and unyielding. The French can found colonies, but they cannot retain them; they could conquer the half of Europe, but they had their city twice taken at last, and the perseverance of Wellington defeated the genius of Napoleon. The French fight for glory, the English from a sense of duty, and—for pay. Francis I. comforted his troops after the defeat at Pavia with the words: "All is lost, save honor." Cromwell advised his steel-clad Ironsides at Dunbar: "Trust in God, and keep your powder dry." Napoleon always appealed to the ambition of his soldiers and told them before the battle of the pyramids, "Forty ages look down upon you;" while Nelson, just before the victory of Trafalgar, simply reminded his crew, that "England expects every man to do his duty."

In the recent Crimean war, the French have gained the lion's share of military glory, and the boasting of the English about their wonderful Armada has been rather put to shame. This they felt themselves. After the first campaign the London "Punch" in his usual good humor, under the caption: "A distinction without a difference," passed the judgment: "Admiral Napier was expected to do something in the Baltic, and he did not; Admiral Dundas was expected to do nothing in the Black Sea, and he did." But it must be remembered, that the English

seldom succeed in the beginning of a war, (think of the disasters of the Peninsular war under Moore,) but are roused as it progresses, and would in all probability have come out to much greater advantage from a third campaign; that the shrewd Russians never gave them a chance for a sea fight; that on land their forces were much inferior in number to those of their Allies; that they suffered immensely from incredible mismanagement in the commissariat; and that they had not the benefit of the admirable military school of Algiers. In spite of these disadvantages they fully sustained their high reputation for admirable discipline, indomitable bravery and perseverance, especially in the terrible battle of Inkermann, and the useless and imprudent, but brilliant charge of the Light Brigade at Balaclava, where a few hundred horsemen, in obedience to a misunderstood order, rushed into "the jaws of death and into the mouth of hell," piercing the Russian battery of guns and a phalanx of Cavalry of five thousand men, one British sword being pitted against a dozen swords, muskets, pistols, rifles and cannons of the enemy, so that the wonder is, not that so many of the small British force were killed, but that any returned to tell of the fight and to furnish the genius of Tennyson the material for his immortal poem.

Yet, after all, the heroic self-denial of Florence Nightingale in the hospitals of Scutari and Sebastopol reflects more real and lasting credit upon England than her bloody victories. What a painful fact, that out of the eighty-eight millions of pounds sterling expended by her government during the fiscal year of 1856, more than seventy-four millions were paid for the interest of former wars, and for the support of the present means of defence! It is a poor comfort that she owes her enormous debt, now exceeding eight hundred millions, to her own subjects. The greatest and noblest triumphs of that nation lie in the arts of peace, and the crowning triumph of British civilization would be the abolition of war itself, with its untold barbarities and sufferings.

But there is little prospect for the speedy attainment of

such an end. If Voltaire remarked of the French that they are half tiger and half monkey, it may be said with as much truth that the English are half lion and half bull. The latter trait shows itself in their love for coarse amusements, such as horse-racing, boxing, cock-fighting, dog-fighting, and in their overbearing conduct to foreign nations. The sad experience of the Crimean disasters has wrought no change. For since then John Bull kept up a great roaring in the Bay of Naples to frighten King Bomba out of his cruelties, and before the walls of Canton to teach the Celestials some respect for the terrestrials. In these two cases the thunder of cannon may be perhaps the most efficient means for the moment, but it is certainly not the one most worthy of a civilized and Christian nation.

It would be unjust, not to mention one redeeming feature, viz : the absence of revenge and the sympathy for the weak against the strong which generally characterizes the Englishman. Even in the pugilistic combat he shakes hands with the antagonist before he begins, and scorns to strike him when he is fairly on the ground. If only John Bull would trouble himself less about other peoples affairs, pay his enormous debt to the last farthing, though he should accompany every guinea with a growl, train his unruly children, especially in Ireland, and attend to his business at home, he would save himself a great deal of unmerited reproach. For after all, "with all his odd humors and obstinate prejudices, John is a sterling-hearted old blade. He may not be so wonderfully fine a fellow as he thinks himself, but he is at least twice as good as his neighbors represent him. His virtues are all his own; all plain, home-bred, and unaffected. His very faults smack of the raciness of his good qualities. His extravagance savors of his generosity; his quarrelsomeness of his courage; his credulity of his open faith; his vanity of his pride; and his bluntness of his sincerity. They are all the redundancies of a rich and liberal character. He is like his own oak; rough without, but sound and solid within; whose bark abounds with excrescences in proportion to the growth

and grandeur of the timber; and whose branches make a fearful groaning and murmuring in the least storm, from their very magnitude and luxuriance."

In the social life of England one of the strongest pillars of her happiness and prosperity is the domesticity which contrasts so strikingly with the lounging, open-air existence of Southern nations. The Englishman does not live with half a dozen families in one building like the French and the Germans; but even in large cities he has a house of his own, and prides in it as an inassailable castle and inviolable sanctuary, where he feels as safe and independent as the Queen at Windsor or Buckingham palace. He delights in his home, fills it with the most substantial comforts, and spends his sweetest hours in the bosom of his family. He knows how to convert the rudest habitation and the most unpromising spot of land into a little paradise

"Where bliss domestic finds a dwelling place;

Domestic bliss, that, like a harmless dove,

Can centre in a little quiet nest

All that desire would fly for through the earth;

* * * * *

That, like a flower deep hid in rocky cleft,

Smiles, though 'tis looking only at the sky."

He holds the conjugal tie peculiarly sacred. Nothing can be better regulated than an English household. Dignity and mutual regard, order and decency rule there supreme. The wife nowhere on the Continent occupies so high and dignified a position. Parental authority is nowhere more respected. The order of servants in the higher classes of England is far superior to anything we know in the United States.

The Englishman delights in the exercise of hospitality on the most liberal scale and will treat you as one of his family, provided you are properly introduced to him. This formality is absolutely necessary, owing to the peculiar reserve of his character and the sacredness of his home. Without it he is apt to take no notice of you whatever. He treats his own countryman no better when he meets

him abroad. It is said that an Englishman let his brother Englishman drown before his eyes in one of the lakes of Switzerland without an attempt to save him, because he was not introduced. *Se non è vero è ben trovato.* To enjoy English hospitality to its full extent, you must follow him to his country seat, where he lays aside the restraints, the hurry, the selfishness of business and city life, and yet surrounds himself with all the conveniences and elegances of polite society, gives full scope to his natural feelings, provides all the means of literary, rural, and social enjoyment to his guest, without putting the least constraint upon him, but leaving every one to his own inclination. Much of that union of strength and elegance, of robustness of frame and tenderness of complexion by which the English gentleman excels, must be attributed to his love for rural life and the invigorating recreations in open air.

English society is thoroughly aristocratic, but with a steady tendency towards an orderly and sensible democracy. The French Revolution, like a flood, swept away the nobility on the Continent, or reduced it to a mere nominal existence. In England it remained unshaken and is as flourishing as ever. Hence the singular fact that there is more equality in France, while there is more liberty, both religious and civil, in England. The former country abolished the law of primogeniture and acknowledges in theory no privileged classes; but it has no habeas corpus act, that strong bulwark of personal freedom in Great Britain and America.

The aristocracy of England is a truly national growth and popular institution. It is not an exclusive and tyrannical power ignoring and disdaining the masses; but it is interwoven with the people by ten thousand ties. It recruits its strength continually from the best elements of the lower classes, and passes into them by a regular gradation from the lords and bishops to the landed gentry and clergy, and from them to the merchants and mechanics; while the aspiring and successful of the lower classes are ever passing into the gentry and occasionally into the no-

bility. The aristocracy furnishes not only the conservative Tories, but also the progressive Whigs, and human rights and liberties find as warm and vigorous champions in the House of Lords as in the House of Commons.

Upon the whole the nobility is the flower of the English nation. As they surpass in physical beauty of the purest and most refined order every similar class of society on the Continent, so also in general education, public spirit, liberal principles and princely generosity. That their immense wealth should lead to many temptations and vices, must be expected. The history of Lord Byron, the Memoirs of Lady Blessington, and the private life of George IV. and William IV.—not to go back to the royal John Bull, Henry VIII.—reveal a large amount of moral corruption among them, but not near as deep and general as that which characterized the French nobility before the Revolution. And after all, there is no class of society which does not furnish the same proof of the awful depravity of human nature. The present royal family of England is esteemed as a model of domestic virtue and happiness, and no one can calculate the power of good example set by an excellent wife and mother, whom Providence has placed on the throne of the largest empire on earth.

But a far more serious objection to the aristocratic institutions of England is the physical and moral degradation of the peasantry, as well as the mining and laboring population which support the higher classes and, like the millions of sand grains at the base of the pyramids, are kept in their place only by the immense weight of the superincumbent structure, however much the whirlwind may scatter them about. It would be unjust indeed to make the nobility alone responsible for the wretchedness of the lower strata of society. Many of the nobles are among the most benevolent and charitable of men. I will only allude to a cotemporary, Lord Shaftesbury, who visits the dens of thieves and holes of misery, who builds model houses for day-laborers, who looks after the interests of the chimney sweeps, in Parliament, and is ever busy in inventing and

carrying out new schemes for the improvement of the sufferings of his fellow-men. Such Christian charity accomplishes infinitely more real good than all the novels of Dickens and that pseudo-philanthropic literature which makes the lower classes interesting at the expense of the higher, which winks at the selfishness of human nature in the one case and exaggerates it in the other, and thus kindles that frightful antagonism between the rich and the poor, which must vent itself at last, if not checked by wholesome reforms, in a fearful social convulsion. The aristocracy proper, then, is clearly not the only cause of the social evils. The manufacturers, the merchants and the moneyed classes generally, are fully as much to blame for them.

For, do we not see already the indications of similar evils in our own country, in spite of its youth, its immense extent, and republican institutions? Does not the inextinguishable thirst for riches, the disgraceful and degrading worship of the golden calf, corrupt our public sentiment and threaten to infect the very life-blood of our community? We will not speak at all of the miserable condition of the unfortunate African race both in the free and in the slave States. But confining ourselves to the white population, it may well be doubted whether even London and Paris exhibit more startling contrasts of wealth and poverty—a fashionable world more extravagant and artificial, hollow and heartless, and a pauperism and crime more sickening and revolting, than New York and New Orleans.

But whatever be the causes, it is a fact that English society presents the greatest contrasts, especially in the mining districts, and the larger cities, such as Edinburgh, old and new, Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester and London. In close proximity to Dawning street, Westminster Abbey, and the new houses of Parliament which the late emperor Nicholas appropriately called "a dream in stones," or behind the magnificent dwellings and stores of Regents Crescent and Circus, there are lanes and closes in which ignorance, vice and misery of the most revolting kind dwell together in horrid confusion.

The greatest domestic difficulty, social and political, of Great Britain is Ireland. It is fully as grievous and perplexing as that which arises from the institution of slavery in our own country. It is the curse of the despotism of race over race, and Church over Church, sanctioned by centuries of legal possession, and for this reason almost beyond the possibility of cure, except by a degree of individual generosity, or governmental sacrifice which would far surpass the indemnification required for the abolition of slavery in the West Indies. In the Roman Catholic or Southern districts of Ireland the amount of pauperism and degradation is incredible. Even in the city of Dublin, where there are so many asylums and charitable institutions, trains of ragged, whining beggars will besiege and entreat you for a morsel of bread. As the nobility and gentry own nearly all the land, the farmers have been reduced to a condition which in point of fact is nothing else than a white-washed system of slavery. Many of them live in low, narrow hovels under one roof with the chickens and pigs, from youth to old age. You may travel through whole counties without finding a farmer who can call one foot of ground his own, outside of the grave-yard, while the proprietor of the immense estate lives unconcerned in princely splendor at London or on the Continent. Add to this, that the poor Irish Catholics are compelled, since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to support an ecclesiastical establishment which, however good in itself, and however well adapted for England, was introduced among the neighbors by the force of arms, and which they regard not only—to use the expression of Hallam—as “a government without subjects, a college of shepherds without sheep,” but as heretical and pernicious, and you have the chief causes of the miseries of the Celtic population in Ireland.

The dark picture is, however, not without some rays of hope. The first difficulty alluded to is now gradually diminishing in consequence of an act of Parliament, called the Encumbered Estates Bill, which, since its passage some six or seven years ago, has caused quite a salutary revolu-

tion in the agricultural and social condition of Ireland and greatly decreased the number of paupers and criminals. It takes a large amount of sadly abused property from the possession of spendthrift landlords and confers it by sale upon a worthy and industrious class of people.

As to the religious cause of the Irish difficulty, an abolition of the Aglican Establishment, as far as Ireland is concerned, would diminish the animosity and do away with reasonable complaints more effectually than the Maynooth grant, which, however just and politic, is inconsistent as far as the government professes a particular religion antagonistic to the Roman. But even the entire severance of Church and State in Ireland would be no radical cure of the evil, just as the abolition of slavery in our Union with the full compensation to the masters for the loss of property out of the national treasury, would still leave open the question of the moral elevation of the negro to a rational enjoyment of freedom in a land which will forever be under the control of the white race. It would seem, that a satisfactory and permanent solution of the Irish problem under its religious aspect, would require either a conversion of the Catholics to the Protestant faith and industry, which has made some progress at least, within the last few years, or their gradual emigration, which is said to have already diminished the number of the Celtic inhabitants to the amount of about two millions, and made room for the immigration of Anglo-Saxons and Protestants from Scotland and England.

Having now briefly considered the deeper strata of society, we are prepared to assign to political liberty its proper place as the third cause of the power and prosperity of England, instead of making it the first and only cause, as Montalembert seems to do. Political liberty is as much the result, as the guardian of the religious and moral character of the nation. It rests on the basis of self-government and respect for authority. Without this, it would long since have run into licentiousness and anarchy and thus proved a failure, like the French Revolutions and the Con-

tinental outbreaks of 1848. England has certainly succeeded far better than any other country of the old world, Switzerland not excepted, in attaining the great end of civil government by reconciling the claims of authority and freedom and thus securing perfect safety of life and property on the one hand, and the uncrippled development of the national and individual resources and energies on the other. Love of freedom and respect for law, manly independence and sincere loyalty, conservatism without stagnation, and progressivism without revolution, are deep rooted traits in the Anglo-Saxon race. It is just this union of apparently opposite tendencies which enables them to steer between the extremes of despotism and anarchy, of absolute monarchy and absolute democracy or rather mobocracy. In this union lies the true genius and security of rational freedom and constitutional liberty which has been transmitted to the American people from the first settlements in Virginia and Massachusetts, in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Individual and local self-government keeps England and the United States from the dangers of centralization, which destroyed true liberty in France even when it bore the name of a republic. For a centralized republic is only another form of despotism.

The guardian of the British liberties is the Constitution, that unseen, yet real power which the Queen and Parliament are as much bound to obey as the humblest citizen, and which is the protection and safety of all. This constitution is not the work of the moment, like those with which Sièyes stocked the pigeon-holes of his bureau, to suit the varying phases of the French Revolution, but it is the natural growth of ages. It is not an instrument simply on paper and an abstract theory of human rights, but a living power in the heart of the people and a practical system in which its true genius is embodied. Such a constitution to which many centuries have contributed their share of wisdom and experience, must necessarily involve anomalies which perplex the theorist and refuse to bend to the strict rules of logic. It is a compromise of principles

with a considerable admixture of no principle at all. But it has also the power of vitality, expanding and adapting itself to the diversified wants of society, keeping pace with the progress of the nation, and yet remaining the same in substance and spirit.

The leading principles of the constitution which underlie the laws and institutions of England, commencing with the origin of the nationality itself and running through the various stages of its historical development, are especially the following: Supreme authority of law; obedience to it until it is lawfully repealed; limitation of the royal power by a national parliament, partly hereditary, partly elective; representation of the various classes of the nation in the legislative council; trial by jury; no centralization of power except as far as is necessary to give unity to the government; no taxation without representation; no punishment without a lawful trial; the Habeas Corpus Act, or the guarantee against arbitrary imprisonment.

These principles are mainly embodied in three great charters which Lord Chatham called the "Bible of the English Constitution," namely the Magna Charta from the year 1215, the Petition of Right from the year 1628, and the Bill of Rights from the year 1689. In each of them the nation at a solemn crisis declared its rights against the arbitrary encroachments of the royal power, and acknowledged its obligations.

In the middle ages, nearly all the monarchies of Western Europe were restricted by fundamental laws and representative assemblies, by the clergy and the nobility. The German emperor was an elective prince and depended to a considerable extent upon the Diet. Spain was more free under Ferdinand and Isabella and under Charles V., than England under Henry VII. or Henry VIII. In France the States-general alone could constitutionally impose taxes. Even Denmark and Sweden had similar constitutions. But the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries swept most of these constitutions away and introduced royal despotism on the Continent. This was especially the case in France,

where Louis XIV. imposed upon the Parliament a patient silence of sixty years and called himself the State (*L' état c'est moi*). A similar attempt was made in England under the Stuarts. But the Long Parliament, the Puritan convulsion, and the orderly Revolution of 1688 saved, strengthened and enlarged the constitution and the liberties of the country.

In that most eventful period of English history, which covers the greater part of the seventeenth century, Protestantism developed itself consistently as a principle of civil and religious freedom, while on the Continent it has been able to produce only a limited degree of toleration. Even Switzerland, though a republic, recognizes properly only two Churches, the Reformed and the Roman Catholic. The freedom of the Church was indeed one of the fundamental articles of the *Magna Charta*. But it was understood at that time in a hierarchical sense, and was confined to the Romish faith. Since the Reformation, the conception of Christianity has been enlarged, and religious and civil liberty have gone hand in hand in the Anglo-Saxon race under the controlling genius of Protestantism, growing deeper and stronger with every successive generation and mutually supporting and strengthening each other. This is what constitutes the great advance of England and the United States over all the nations of the earth. In both respects the American constitution again goes, in principle, a step beyond the English, especially in regard to the freedom of religion, which is here left to develop all the energies of Christianity without the interference and encroachments of the secular power.

Yet, after all, the most perfect constitution and the largest amount of liberty could as little guarantee the welfare and prosperity of a nation, without a healthy public sentiment, as a tree may be expected to grow without the continual nourishment of the soil and the supply of air, rain and sunshine. Liberty must go hand in hand with education, education with virtue, virtue with religion. Christianity, as we said in the beginning, is, after all, the deepest

cause of the greatness of England. Blot it out, and her glory is departed, her civilization and refinement would rapidly degenerate, and her liberties perish. True Christianity, the Christianity of the everlasting Gospel is the guardian angel of Great Britain and America, and the only hope of the world.

Mercersburg, Pa., May, 1857.

P. S.

ART. II.—CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

ARCHITECTURE has been well defined, "an act of devotion symbolically uttered." If to this be added, "through forms and arrangement of rocks and stones resulting in the temple," the definition will be complete, including the whole of Architecture, from the rude cromlech to the great cathedral, and excluding all that ought to be excluded, all structures of wood, iron, clay, brick, in a word of any material different from rock, or that which may be cut with the chisel, and of course excluding all buildings except the temple. Domestic architecture, so called, is a thing not known in the world before the times of the Roman empire. If the palace-temple of Egypt were such indeed, it was so to the same degree in which the Gothic Minster is a dwelling-house because the sexton lives in one of its cloisters. In like manner is it of the essence of our definition to deny positively, even as it were a very article in the matter, that any building made of other material than stone can belong to Architecture. Buildings of wood, iron, plaster, are no more to be included under the term, than figures moulded in wax or glass are to be included under Sculpture. We have here chosen an aesthetic parallel. The true reason, however, why none but the rock

or stone building, and no building but the temple, or the church, is properly architectural, lies deeper, and is embraced in the statement that the first building erected by man, or nations, the last building, the great building—in a word, *the building* erected by man, is the altar, and it grew out of the inevitable nature of the case that it should be of stone.

Not because the rock would resist the action of fire, not because the log-temple would not answer every economic purpose of a temple, but simply because it was not possible, in the circumstances of the case, that men, out of trees or timber, should make an altar. The first altar—all celtic architecture, we mean, is manifestly of the earth, earthy—the tree was far too high to the Heaven he had abandoned for the man to begin with it. It must be something inorganic—something not genial—something hard and remote, without passion or fruit. Men could, afterwards, as they did, build their altar within the forest, but men, that is men who were sinners, worshipped through rocks and stones, long before they could dare to worship through organic nature, which at so many points is in sympathy with the true man; whereas he had denied his own law, and the growing tree was a reproach to him, he dashed into that which was no law, but holds as a brooding presence, an impersonal power. The first thing sinners laid hold of after the deluge, was the boulders which the deluge had left, and the quarries which the deluge had made. From the heights of Paradise man fell, even as into the abysmal caverns of the places underneath the earth, and thence drew his architecture. It was the rock, the most pertinent impersonation of the abnormal and abhorrent condition of his own heart. Whoever has been in the midst of the cavernous earth, or stood alone at the foot of some vast frowning rock, and has given but a moment's thought to the work wrought in the heart of the natural man by sin, will be at no loss to perceive how natural it was that out of the midst of earth's bowels it should bring forth both the material and the elements, wherewith to

build up its guilt-begotten image, its altar, its temple, to its god. But even so it is, that while this temple is a form of demon-worship, it is also through the same, and it is even from the quarry itself, that the man is to work his way upward again; as if sent to the very roots of the earth which he had caused to be cursed, and from its deep foundation of rock to work out his own and the earth's regeneration.

We have, thus far, only been saying that man was made an artistic, or poetic, religious being—that he fell into sin, and that coming to his bad consciousness in the pit of his degradation, he rose up to build, carrying with him the elements of nature into which he fell—most fearfully symbolized in the brooding spirit of the rock, and the darkness of the cave. There may be religious beings who do not build—such are the angels who have kept their first estate—they need no forms, they project none—they are a form to themselves. If there be temples in Heaven, they are temples with a resurrection body. But every fallen being must go on to build—he must project in visible form the image of his heart, as a propitiatory image for the god of his imagination. It is an irresistible quality of sin which constrains the transgressor to erect some image of his guilt, to enjoy at its feet the sympathy of loss and misery. At this point there is a sense in which we may say that the earth's face and the ocean's surface, all the forms, structures and products of civilization, as the work of the natural man, are architectural; for architecture, that is to say, the highest reach of man's works, is but the broadest illustration of that great law and appointment that under grace, the race of mankind is to be delivered from sin, and at last sanctified, through the labor of the flesh—through the subduing of the earth.

Thus we are reminded again, how the effects of the fall are overruled, in an unspeakable wonder of mercy, so as to help man back to perfectness. A fallen being must go on to build, but except under a purpose of mercy and restoration on the part of his Maker, must go on to build

to no purpose—even as Milton has well depicted the works of those lost angels in that lowest of worlds, where every work must come to nought. Man fell, not into so low a depth—not into the very midst of chaos, full of positive riot, as well as shapelessness and unreality. He would have so fallen, as the inevitable result of the violation of the great law of his being, had not peculiar mercy interfered. He fell into inorganic nature—he fell into the earth, not below the earth. Thus, had he kept his law, he would through the Spirit have kept his whole being, would have drawn his body nigh to God. Having denied the Spirit, he fell under the dominion of the body, and that body was made of earth. He made himself one with the lower creature. And now we behold him first building as in the caves of Ellera, then in Druid pillars and circles, then in Egyptian pyramids, obelisks and pylones, and at last, and in a regular, though, long-progressing order, in the perfect beauty of the natural man as revealed in the Doric temple.

Is it possible, we wonder, that the pure and good Spirit could have had anything to do with works reeking in the airs of the earth-spirit, and demon-worship, such as those that still haunt the plains of the Nile? Yes, it is possible and it is certain. We know not how, but we do know that the good Spirit, for Christ's sake, did not forsake the man into whose nostrils He had breathed. The history of natural Architecture, that is of the Architecture of every nation except the Jewish, whose Architecture was the Ceremonial Law, is a history of the progress of the world's preparation, in some way, under the good Spirit, for the Incarnation of the Son. We may get nearer to the conception of the truth as thus corroborated in the facts of the world's great works, by the aid of the thought already intimated. The disciplinary process of the race began with the command, "Subdue the earth." In order to this, the man—the natural man—the typical man of the nations as yet without the covenant—was sent to the foundations of nature—was sent where his perverted heart took him—sent

to the nearest opposite—to the spirit within him which he had denied, that could be, this side the state of the lost. Now, at this point we recollect, that if man had kept the Spirit he would have kept the whole creature, at whose apex he stood, with him; that when he fell he dragged the creature with him; and that when his redemption is perfected, he will raise the creature with him. When he shall have subdued the earth, out of which his body was made, then will come the resurrection body, and then will the "earnest expectation" be realized in the "new heavens and the new earth." What more forcible, nay what more painfully forcible an illustration of the fact of the curse on the earth, and the law of the appointment to man—through suffering, through agonies, through labor, through manifold pains of flesh and spirit, reach the goal—than a Stonehenge circle, or an Egyptian Pyramid? They are altars, altars to demons, altars that have devoured like a Moloch, raised in pain, covered with blood, built in the midst of sighs, and groans, and howlings—which yet the men that built them were happy in rendering. There is not one of them, but the ghosts of thousands and thousands of our fellow-men lay thick thereon as the air that envelops them. And was all this for nought? Had there been no purpose of mercy for man, it were; but otherwise, a work has been done which, in the perverseness of sin, was needful for the subduing of the earth. It was a work completed for the natural man, in Greece, disseminated by Rome, inherited by us. We cannot tell how the good Spirit overruled this work, but we know the fact, we are reaping the benefit, and we feel our safety in the inheritance when we rightly remember our Creed—"He descended into Hades."

The Cathedral, that is the great artistic exponent of the Catholic Church, could not (speaking after the manner of men) have been, without that work of the nations. That Cathedral is seen to include and absorb, under the progress and law of its aesthetic evolution, every line of every preceding architecture, not excepting that of the false prophet, made into one through and over all. The Architecture

(the Ceremonial Law) of the chosen nation even, could not be, it seems, without the work of Egypt. And even thus is it, that the nations, while building their demon-temples, were commencing and doing their part in the great work of subduing the earth. They fixed the spirit of the rock, the cave,—the brooding genius of earth's foundations,—in the terrible and overpowering forms of pagan architecture, which we, with the better faith, have taken hold of and conquered, through the Spirit. The Grecian temple is the natural man conquering the demon of earth by mental power and ideal beauty; the Cathedral is the Egyptian temple laid hold of by a far more daring hand. It could not have been done, had not the great work of the Greek been done; could not, had not the physical daring of the Roman come in. But such being the case, the Crusader went into the Nile-temple, holding the cross in one hand, and with the other commanding out and sending to the Cathedral, every element of the heathen work he saw fit and forceful. He took captive the pyramid, he took captive the towns, he took captive the darkness—he conquered all through the Spirit—and the Cathedral stands the grandest of all visible witness, that the work of the world has been for a contribution to that Church, which has now, in turn, become the mother of all nations.

And this is the reason we hold it of the essence of Architecture, considered most ultimately, that it shall consist of the rock; the work of which it is the great ethnical witness, necessarily, as we have seen, and according to the Divine appointment also, beginning at the foundation of the creature in the rock. Had this work commenced with the tree, a product of the soil, possessing a genial law, the most important stage would have been left out, it being the earth that is to be subdued; vegetable forms come in, at the proper time, to give beauty and sympathy, when the man was ready. Still, however, the first appropriation of growing nature will be of that known to geology, the first tree known to architecture will be the trees and foliage impressed in the sand-stone strata. Even so far as to the

roots of the mountains do we deem it from the truth, that the heathen temple ever in its origin had knowledge of the log-cabin.

Whether this reasoning be correct or not, here is the fact, that all architecture has begun with the rock, the earth-mound, the monolith, and so proceeded to the cut stone, to the sculptural column; and in ornamentation from inorganic forms to foliate enrichment. Every family of the building Art has had its Celtic period; and all Celtic style, even to its details, has had its period of struggle in the inorganic nature. The architecture of the perfect natural man, the Greek, begins at an archaic point above all others; its ornamentative reveals the inorganic world only in the forms of the chrystal, and its "abstract" is of vegetable nature arrested at a point where nature *would* have produced flowers in stone, had the rock gone on to do so. The Greek Honeysuckle is a mental flower, wrought out by those whose mission it was to bring the rock to the confines of the glad and human day-light world of growing nature. And what the Honeysuckle is, such is the Grecian temple, even such as the marble rock would have grown into had it been endowed with organic law, the law of mental beauty. The Pentelic quarry would have cropped out in the Parthenon. But even the Gothic itself, which is the architecture of the "*natura naturans*," takes its beginning in the "*natura naturata*," just as the Ceremonial Law had a certain beginning in the pyramid. The Lombardic, Norman, Romanesque, or by whatever other name the Gothic base may be called, reveals, in its mouldings, the forms of the chrystal and the shell, before it goes, with the Psalmist, into the fields to bring in the flowers, in Christian fidelity and love.

Thus far, then, we find in the Architecture of the pagan nations plainly revealed the singular mercy of the Christian dispensation, which permits and causes that the work done by fallen man, shall be work done to purpose; not the work of a self-wrought chaos, not the work of the lost; but an appointed world-work, which has brought up the gran-

ite ribs of earth and death, to pave with all in groans and tears and blood, the way for Him who came to save the world. The obelisk and the minaret, the colonnade and the Roman Bridge, are pointing and bridging the way for the nations to come to their healing, the Church. The fallen race of man, being constrained by their fall, to build, to build mightily, to build in their wickedness, even as Babel was built; building from the deep places of the earth, and striving to reach the heavens thus, even as all merely natural civilization builds—this man is, through the unutterable mystery of the purpose of Redemption, permitted even thus and so to build himself up towards a new perfectness, and to draw that nature, which is his instrument, with him. No abiding work of the nations, then, can have been in vain. The Church, departing for the land of promise, was required to demand of the heathen people the loan which was afterwards found in the materials of the true Tabernacle; and so, to this day, does the Church borrow of the man. In the Cathedral, by the Pentecostal Spirit, do we most religiously inherit those gifts of overruling grace and mercy, which we have properly received through the media of Babylon and India, of Egypt and Greece and Rome, and directly through the great Christian people of the Middle Ages, which is the sanctified nation, the Church.

Examining now more closely the theology of the Egyptian temple—for the temple, let us remember, is but the greatest and most authentic image of the heathen man's faith, far more (and worse) than the Creed to the Christian, since it is the actual embodiment of the dark spirit of his mythology—and we find his conception of the Deity represented altogether in the two elements of physical size and mystic darkness. The idol of the temple is in an adytum as dark as a cave, dark as only Egyptian darkness is dark. This adytum is the final cause of the building; placed at the remotest point from the vestibule, forming the interior of the apex, as it were, of the obelisk laid on the ground; for it is a noticeable fact that the ground-plan, and side-elevation of every Egyptian temple shows that the

building is included within the lines of an immense obelisk laid upon the earth. This dark adytum has then its approach through vast avenues composed of the colossal Sphinx,—that riddle of the rock, that revolting embodiment of the genius of the granite, taking on a living form which is neither human nor divine, but essentially pantheistic. There is no more forcible or potent impersonation of that fearful being, or power rather, which is the “thrice-untold darkness of the nature-worshipper’s god,” and of all pantheism, than the Egyptian Sphinx. It is a personification of the mere physical intellect; a conception which would be relieved, to the Christian mind, by the addition of a heart, though it might be that of a fiend. Dagon or Moloch or the bloody god of the Druid circle, is a far less chilling conception than is that of those stolid, ruthless, passionless abortions of the carnal mind, those basilisk embodiments of the unknown power that broods at earth’s roots and in the abnormal airs of earth’s caves,—in a word, those daimon-endowed figures of geometry, which line the way to fascinate and devour, without biting, the man that approaches the temple of the Nile.

It must have been, in effect, as a night-mare, under which the victim not only could not give forth a sign, but in which he must consent to feel that it behooves him not even to make the attempt. At the end of this avenue he is met by the obelisks and the colossal guards of the temple—then is drawn under a gate-way which seems to have disemboweled a quarry, then through pillars, columns and osirides, which in their vast proportions and mystic forms, do but take up the sepulchral whisper of the Sphinx, a whisper that would break into ten thousand thunders if the man were competent so to dare it—next through quadrangles filled with the sculptured typhon, and Isis, in her mock mildness, more dreadful still—beneath roofs that could crush a nation, and more and still deeper drawn into the darkness all so endowed, he reaches at last the climax, or the bathos, of this huge wonder, in the sacred adytum. This vast temple of the Nile is one tremendous monolith,

laid down by the Pharaoh-nation as the Egypt-nation's god. It is also still farther not unlike the solid obelisk, inasmuch as its interior is all the more solidified by the astounding exorbitancy of its characteristic Art. This is the penetralia of this first world-temple, made to be the darkness which may be felt, and in which "moveth the spirit amid worlds not realized," but, as we can predict already, most surely to come to pass.

We conceive the analysis so important to Comparative Architecture, that we must run the risk of becoming tedious by repeating that the Egyptian temple is the inorganic nature, in its own case the granite, the foundation rock, reconstructed in the sciential mind, the understanding, the lowest of the mental nature, under the abnormal law of sin. It is, as it were, that nature put to what, but for its ulterior and overruled working in the great Economy, would have been an unstable "set" of the laws of forces, and hence, liable, as has been said, to crash back into chaos at a touch. It is of the earth, earthy. Its geometric forms are not without beauty, but it is the beauty of geometry, not of the heart. Its embryonic foliage grew where fishes without eyes or blood grow—in the stifling gloom of the cavern. There is little about it with which the Christian man can sympathize—he can feel the physical glory of its fatiguing vastness, and verily we can feel the dreadfulness of its demon power and spirit. The Grand Hall of Karnac, which has collected the entire beauty of Egyptian Art, must ever pale the spirit and curdle the veins of every being that has a heart. No man should enter it without the sign of the Cross. The one great element of the power of Egyptian Art is that of its preposterous vastness, both actually and artistically represented, in size, proportion, darkness, and dread—all operating to the oppressing of the understanding. Of course unity cannot be predicated of it. It is a mere unicity, a simply monstrous isolation, and hence mistifying, as mere number without unity always is. So far as it is applicable to modern purposes, it should be confined to prisons, and to the houses where Rationalism

draws its votaries to their gatherings. It is utterly without the Spirit, without intuition, a lifeless and bloodless solidification of no mystery, but of a mere logical mistification.

Nevertheless it did its work, it did an indispensable rudimentary work, it helped to prepare the way. The Christian child's idea of power is associated first with physical greatness, and results in the mysticism of the ungeneralizing understanding; and then as the faculty of unity in the reason is developed the child begins to ascend to the conception of mental and spiritual power; and so from a mere arithmetical notion of vastness and multitude, which is mysticism, it rises through the Spirit, which by the new man gives the highest generalization and the most universal unity possible to any creature thought; and so by faith comes at last to the intuition of the true mystery, which is, through the coming of the Lord, the highest experience of the created being. Hence this Art of Egypt, huge shadow that it is, becomes an infinitesimal atom to the Christian man, who has beheld in spirit, the unity of God and of all things, in the Person of the Incarnate Son. Hence it stands to Greek Art, in the natural world, under a somewhat analagous parallel as the Mosaic economy, the Sinite revelation of the Deity stands to the revelation of God in Christ, through the Incarnation by the Spirit. Greek art is, in its own way, the incarnation of the Egyptian. It reduced the elements of size and darkness, and not only retained, but vastly magnified its power, by humanizing it. There is no demon about the Greek temple, it is all man, the perfect man of this world. It is a purely mental creation, not supernatural in any sense. Wherever the mere mind of man is, there a Grecian temple may be and will be beautiful. It is in no sense provincial or conventional, it is the absolutely perfect work of the natural mind. It is the climacteric flowering of the development of that wonderful race, whose commission it was to perfect the uninspired process, to finish the work of the nations, and to bring them in to the coming of the Lord. The Doric

/

temple stands to Christianity as the words of the Greek language stand to the revelation they contain.

Grecian Art is a proper unity, a real ideal *one*—not a gigantic singleness, a mephitic ice-berg split from the totality like the Egyptian; nor is it the far worse-glinted berg of the modern unitarianism, falsely so called, for since it is without the constitutive three, it plainly can possess no other one, than the primitive arithmetic possesses, which can only count by heaping. Such a miscalled one, is but a fragment, pretensive as in its nature it must always be; is but a “*this, a that, a here, a there.*” Inasmuch, however, as the Grecian temple has not as yet attained to the spirit, it has not by any means, so high a unity as the Gothic. It is a multiplicity in unity, for such is the civil man; it is not a multitudinousness, a universe, in unity, like the Gothic, for such alone is the spiritual man. The human race could no more have represented itself in such architecture as the Gothic, without Christ and the Spirit, than they could have risen from sin to holiness of themselves. The Greek temple is the world, the mental world, accessible to the natural man, it is all that Plato was—the cathedral is the universe, known only to the spiritual man, and is what St. Paul was without his inspiration, what Augustine was, what a Kempis was. The Egyptian is mundane at the lowest, and geometrical at its highest point. It is the human representation of that earth which to the Egyptian was the abode and the form of that spirit, or power, not person, that brooded in the depths, endowed the rock-mountains, rested on the desert, and had its secret places in the atmosphere of the land of the Nile. It is the embodied silence of the first-born Pantheism.

The Greek temple represents a person, an individual. It is to the Egyptian what an angel is to a ghost, what a cherub is to a geni, what the real man is to the spectre-man of the Brocken. It is the work of a people who, through civil freedom, had come to the consciousness of the individual man. It is, therefore, the work of the State, not of

the hierarchy, and it is, therefore, human, as opposed to demoniacal—and, at the same time, of course, it is, therefore, altogether mental. It stands the witness that the man had conquered the earth-spirit, the nation hath the victory over the powers. Jupiter Ammon has become “ambrosial” Jove, the remote Isis has become the genial Minerva, the oppressive Sphinx has become the far-darting light of Apollo. The temple stands on the hill-top; no more burrowing into rocks, no more the earthly darkness, no more the crushing mass of mere physical Art—but a far higher power, a far nobler development, the beauty of the mind. If man had not sinned, and had gone on to build temples in Paradise, they would have used the Pentelic marbles, and built as that people built who were the last originators before the coming in of the new day for the race. The Parthenon of Athens is the unmistakeable sign that the work of the nations is done. When a people were found who could cast out the demon-gods of the old world, could place the human Jove on the seat of the Titans, and fill Olympus with deities like men—then we may be sure is the time approaching for the true coming, of which the Greek mythology is, indeed, a travesty, but it was a wonderful travesty, and it was, as far as the nations could go, in its own way, a type of the true. The Grecian people say, at every point of their development, that if there be an universal Father to men, He must declare Himself in the form of the man. The Grecian temple means the same. It represents the point of natural, or civil perfectness arrived at through a mental incarnation. The Grecian column differs not from the Grecian statue, vase, poem, or thought; it is a thing with which the civil mind of man in all ages must sympathize.

To trace, then, from the age of Pericles, the progress of our Art, we find that during those last four hundred years before the Christian era, a two-fold work was going on. The nations were becoming Judaized, and at the same time becoming Hellenized, and that through the same people, the Romans. The Roman people had its mission, to dis-

seminate what in the Greek had been concentrated and elaborated of the heathen world, and to consolidate the nations. As they originated nothing, so they originated no architecture. The Corinthian columns scattered every where throughout the world, while they show that the Roman conqueror has been there, show also that the Greek thinker had gone before him. The single thing originating with the Romans, in the way of Art, was the application of the circular arch to the building of bridges. It is significant of the people and their work, to make a high road for the nations to come at last to the true law, to the true unity. *Populus Romanus* is the Pontifex maximus of the race. This arch, it is true, became the Dome, as in the Pantheon, but it required another people, and other conditions, to transmute the dome into Art. The dome is the world, and nothing short of faith can overcome that dome in an aesthetic victory. The Roman nation has well left itself represented as in the literal circle, and bridge-like ceiling of the Pantheon, having its main architecture in stolen Greek columns. When the perfect mental incarnation of the horizontal Grecian, has come to be consubstantiated in the literal pragmatism of a building, whose plan is a flat circle, and whose sign is the bridge—an enclosure tangible at every point, and imprisoning on all sides, except one breathing hole in the top—we may be certain the man is degenerating, and that nothing now can save him from relapsing into the tomb of Atreus or the pyramid of Egypt, except a peculiar interposition from above. That which is above nature must come down to him, or the whole work of the world shall have been to no purpose. That which is supernatural is revealed. The Spirit *does* come down, and comes at the very time when the world declares, even at the climax of the four thousand years of forbearance, that it cannot get back to God—that the help of man is vain.

Down to the time of Constantine, the Christian temple, the Church, is to be found in the saints of the Most High. Its Architecture must be sought in its creeds, perhaps more

accessibly represented in men. Let a Christian artist sculpture a Jerome, or a Cyprian, an Athanasius or a Chrysostom, and we should have the spirit of what the architecture proper of the period would have been. But it is obvious to remark that a development so distinctively new as the Christian, could not commence in an artistic representation. Even the Jewish did not so commence—the Patriarchs preceding Moses. So also the civil nation does not begin with Art, for Art is a development out of the nation. The American people, with all its favorable antecedents, has not yet expressed itself in Art, unless our ships and steamboats are so to be considered. Much less could Catholic Christendom, in its early periods, have come to that degree of self-consciousness which begins to reveal itself in the forms of Art. Its place of worship was indifferently the cave, the catacomb, the upper-room, or the mountain-glen. Its place of worship was the world. But Christianity must, of all things, show what it judges of the world, what it feels concerning itself, what it hopes for as it respects the life to come. It has done so in the Cathedral ; but the process has been a long one.

Latin Christianity went into the Basilica. It was essentially a Romanized Greek building, under the empire, the place of administration of law. Not by accident did the Roman Church enter there, for Rome is still the executive power in the world. This Basilica now forms the nave, or the whole west end of the perfect Cathedral. It is that part of the building which is for the gathering of the people, the congregation. Grecian Christianity went into the cruciform, dome-covered, St. Sophia of Byzantium. It reached forth its equal arms to all points of the compass, it invited all nations, but had not room sufficient for the congregation. Under the shadow of its vast dome we find the christianized descendant of the race that did the final thinking for the heathen world. That dome is not the Roman, nevertheless the Patriarch is indebted to Rome for it, even as Rome is indebted to the East for the forms and columns of the Basilica. It is an aerial dome in suspen-

sion, it is a dome and two semi-domes in plan, and it is pierced for the light of heaven to enter. It is the place where thought, meditation, reflection is done—it waits the Basilica, the executive, to distribute, to enforce, to consolidate its work. The Patriarch elaborated the Creed, the Pope gave it to the nations. To this time it had been the period of origins, the shaping era scarcely commenced till the age of Justinian.

We have distinctly, then, the Basilica, a Romanized Greek building, the chosen place of Western Christianity; and a Graeco-Roman building, the product of Eastern—these united, give the full Cathedral. There is, under Christianity, a commutual interfusion of the two peoples, which, under heathendom, wrought more apart, but had, under that dispensation, an analogous work to do in the way of the first preparation. We find these elements perfectly united in the ecclesiastical buildings of the early Middle Ages. The Cathedral of St. Marks at Venice, the Cathedral of Worms in Germany, the Duomo of Florence, are formed simply by adding the Basilica to the West arm of the St. Sophia of Byzantium, or the St. Vitalis of Ravenna,—thus giving the nave proper to the building. And this has continued without alteration, to be the great ground-plan of the Cathedral; the nave, with its side-aisles, and close-story, the transept, the dome developed into the tower, the choir and the chancel. We have by no means as yet, however, the full Christian Art.

It will be necessary to look at the details. The interior of the great buildings mentioned, is heavy and oppressive. There is a certain archaic spirit about it that reminds us of the elemental airs of the early heathen styles. The classic nations have become mingled with the Gothic—though the buildings are still in the hands of the classics. It is a transitional period necessary for catholicity, but shows us of the natural man. Moreover, we find the identical zig-zag, and scroll mouldings, which mark the Egyptian, the Pelasgic, and indeed all Celtic architecture—the whole showing that the Christian nation also is in a ferment, in a great formative process.

It will be instructive, then, to compare this Norman, Lombardic, Byzantine, or Romanesque, with its Graeco-Roman prototype. Looking down the side of the nave of the Basilica, we find it composed of a series of classic columns with circular arches springing from their capitals, and above these arches the old horizontal cornice. That member, the cornice, is a characteristic member of classic art—it must give way, if art is to be liberated, that is, if it is to become aspiring, aerial, heavenly, as opposed to that which is definite, mental, and worldly. If there is to be a Christian Architecture, its lines must no longer rest horizontally upon the earth, nor must it be defined within any actual limits, certainly not bound by the circle, which is the palpable line of this world. Now we do actually find that the full Christian Art develops itself in the final triumph of the infinite line—that is to say, in a line based upon earth, which is one end of the infinite for man, and tending, without limits, upwards toward heaven.

The process begins with that very circular arch of the Romans, that arch which is their sign as the world-conquerors. The interior of St. Sophia, or of St. Vitalis, reveals already the work begun. In the Pantheon we have the solid dome, resting upon a strongly marked horizontal ordinance. In St. Sophia, the aerial dome, with the multiplied side-domes, arches, and piers, showing a decided triumph of the perpendicular tendency. In St. Vitalis, still more decided. In the succeeding growth of the Byzantine into the Norman, or Romanesque, the victory is complete—the entablature is gone—the cornice is bent into the archivolt mouldings, and there is nothing wanting but the abolition of the circular arch, vault, and dome, to cause the Cathedral of Worms to take on the full glory of the Cathedral of Cologne. The palpable commencement of this stage of the great growth, that is of turning the Romanesque into the Pointed, is due to the people of North Germany. It began with the elevation of the old lines of the Pediment into the high lines of the gable. The Portico of the convent of Lorsch shows, as in a picture, the

work done. Above the lower tier of Romanesque arches in that most instructive façade, we have an ordinance of lofty pointed gables, the elevation, as it were, of the zig-zag moulding into an integral portion of the upper mass. Here is already then a base, a frame-work, for that pointed arch which is to complete the development, and liberate the building from every limiting line.

But whence came the pointed arch? It came unquestionably from the Orient. It is the contribution of the false prophet to the Christian Church. It was indeed a great contribution when come to the hand and faith of the Christian; but the Moslem had already stolen the idea of it from the Church of the Eternal Wisdom, had elaborated its idea, as far as it was ever possible for him to do, sooner than the Goth could have done, and had produced in connection with it only the factitious brilliancy of his sentimental Arabesque. The Church was in need of it, and the Crusader brought it. If he did not gain the sepulchre, he gained that which became to the waiting Cathedral the occasion of its final perfection. Instantly and coinstantaneously over Christendom, arises the Pointed, the so called Gothic, the perfect Christian architecture. The building is still the cross, but no longer the cross resting upon earth, it is the cross, it is the Holy Catholic Church, rising and rising and ever rising towards heaven. In the triumph of the upright line lies its boundlessness. It is inexhaustible, illimitable, never-ceasing, like the procedure of the allgrowing nature, which is the sign of that Spirit which garnisheth the heavens and reneweth the face of the earth. And this nature is its aesthetic parallel. No more of the earth, no more of the cave, or the rock, it goes side by side with the nature that grows, that is organic, that has life, that is genial and human, and that is to us an especial sacrament of the only life-giving Spirit, not to be apprehended apart from the Incarnation. Let us suppose it possible the Jewish nation had been commissioned to represent in stone the feast of Tabernacles, typical in the products of the field and forest, of the Incarnation through the life-giving Spir-

it, and it would have resulted in the Gothic building, with its heaven-tending lines, its indefinite boundaries, and its exquisite foliage ornamentation.

This perpendicularity is now the ruling law of the Art. Not only does the pointed arch lift up, and abolish the circular vault; but it multiplies into groinings and cross-ribs, so as to make a limit above, which yet is not a limit. It cannot open the roof to the air, and, therefore, it will enchain and multiply and consecrate the air under the ceiling. The only caves about the Gothic are the caves of the groinings, turned into heavenly chambers, bounding the upward view only with an atmosphere of glory, with angelic cells that do but take up and prolong in choral echo the grand music of the whole temple. And thus at last, too, is the imprisoning dome abolished. We must here say again, that we hold it a settled fact of Architecture, that the circular arch has its function wholly in the bridge, the aqueduct, the civil and domestic building. It consists in a line that returns upon itself. It starts from the earth, and it returns into the earth. It can only become continuous in the arcade, and cannot there become a unity. It is not one, it is again a singleness, an unicity. Two lines leaning against each other, as in the gable, or the pointed arch, make together one, and that one is a resulting third, namely, the idea of relation between the two. It will always require three elements to produce a unity. Thus the Romanesque nave, taken by itself, was but a continuous repetition or heaping of a single thing;—the true Gothic nave is the growing reproduction, the real running into one another of distinct individualities, all collected into a general unity. Look at an isolated circular arch—and it is nothing. Look at an isolated pointed arch, and it has a decided character of itself. So, too, the circular dome, even that of St. Peters, we hold to have its effectiveness mainly as the Egyptian has,—it is the mere exaggeration of a single element, it is of the nature of the giant.

But how did the pointed arch modify the circular dome? First by pointing and greatly elevating it, as at Pisa, and

Florence. Though here again the frame-work had been prepared, as in the other instance of the gable. A single glance at the aerial domes of the Byzantine architects, will show a vast Christian improvement upon the world-dome of the Pantheon. It is lifted into air; it is multiplied, striving to gain a unity; it is enlightened. All this, however, is by no means sufficient; the actualness of the limiting line must give way, as was done by the groinings upon the nave ceiling; else, after all, it can only result in the dome of India, or of the Saracen. The upright line must conquer the circular, the spirit must rise through the dome to heaven. The palpable dome is accordingly transmuted into the central Tower—the enclosing and crushing horizon is concentrated in the zenith of the building, which is thus the never-finished norm and climax of the style. No greater mistake could be committed upon the Gothic building than that of bringing the central tower to anything like an actual finish, as in the spire or cupola. It forms the invisible flower of the whole style, the pledge and sacrament of its perfect worldly emancipation, and its true marriage with the skies. It was the last great work of the Christian nation, when faith was enabled to realize its final unity in the Heavenly Head, seen in the building by the bodily sense, seen through the building by the spiritual. The actual dome, thus taken captive by the spirit, *must* not be brought over again, till faith is turned into sight, till the Lord shall come to His temple on the regenerated earth, till the day when matter shall no longer be an obstacle to the body.

Once more looking along the side of the Pointed nave, we find not only that the entire horizontal order above the columns has disappeared, but the column itself is gone; it has become the deeply channelled pier, the clustered shaft, the continuous line; the rush of the perpendicular current has enveloped the style; it starts now from the pavement. And this rush is upward, it is not the element of any earth current, it is not galvanism or geometry, or intellect;—it is spirit. The stone is so cut and dug into and channelled,

that not merely the line and the plane are brought into requisition, as in all previous styles, but air, space, and shadow—it forms the representative element of the holy and awful mystery, of the Church. It is at this point we find the Gothic Interior endowed with a certain living spirit, apart from its sculptured ornamentative, which is essentially distinct from that of all other styles. The Egyptian has verily a living spirit about it, but it is a living death, a choking silence, a dreadful brooding. The Greek has its own life, but it is the life of this world. The Roman has power, but it is the power of the arena. The Gothic has a life which is new and wholly peculiar; it is the life of the Christian man, the life of the Church, the life of the Spirit. In the Cathedral at last the earthly Christian man is within an artistic embodiment, which taxes, fills and satisfies his artistic nature to its utmost capacity, and at the same time does so in a salutary way, because it does so through and for his spirit. In the Cathedral he may feel safely, worship safely, hope safely, and breathe peacefully. He is not in danger of having the truthful action of his heart distorted, as under the terms of the Egyptian, or of becoming enamored of this world's beauty, as before the Grecian, or of being drawn into the rush of animal enthusiasm as by the Arabesque or Roman. He is in the grandest, most beautiful, and most safe place, when in the Cathedral, that the world has yet produced, and for this reason, namely, because at last *he is under the shadow of the cross*,—we mean he is in a style where artistic finish is seen to coincide with its religious development in a final, that is the final type for both. As the Cathedral starts with the cross in plan, so it finishes, so its art finishes in the Final-Cross, and thus Art and Faith have at last become a representative one.

There is no such unity among the race's works, as the unity of the Cathedral. It is incomparably the highest, the broadest, the fullest of all. Now, again, we know that such a unity is possible only in connection with the world of the spirit, the supernatural. Here it is man's faculty, for

the infinite finds its expression—and this, of course, for the sinful man, can only be through revelation. And thus are we able to perceive how the Cathedral, that is Christian Art, has come to be the incomparable miracle that it is among the race's doings, and that every Cathedral constrains us to feel that it is. It is not long wonderful that man could build as the Egyptians did, or as the Greeks, but it is a never ceasing wonder how man could build as the Gothic builders did—until we come to recollect that it was not of man. Let the perpendicular line be given, that is, the line that once started takes on its own growth, even as the fields and forests show us, and the style must develop, it will of itself carry the builder's hand with it. Not so the Greek, in which the man must elaborate every step. But how came this perpendicular line to be started? What but the good Spirit could teach the sinful man to dare to urge the growth of his temple into heaven itself? Mentally, therefore, on the ground of the mere natural man, the Doric building is the greater work, even as Plato was a greater man than Clemens;—spiritually, and thus drawing the man, reason, intellect, imagination and all, as the instrument of a higher Power, the Cathedral is incomparably the greatest work of the ages,—even as the Church is the greatest of all. The Cathedral thus shows us what the Christian Faith has done for the natural and civil man. The transition from the forming period of Byzantine Art, to the flowering of the true Gothic, was almost instantaneous. Not only did the style become grander, but at the same time became most beautiful. We shall find the base of a Cathedral in the heavy forms of the Norman, with crude Celtic enrichments, and the exquisite lines of the Greek elements debased into actual grotesqueness, and, as it were, in a moment, shall see the order above the base, flowering into the most exquisitely beautiful forms of the Christian Pointed. The power was not of man, it was a Higher Power guiding the man. It was a Power, it was the Holy Spirit of God, leading the man of faith at once into the world of genial nature. But how then is it that

the perfect Cathedral still retains something of an Archaic element, as in its animal sculptures? The reason lies in all the difference between being compelled to do a certain thing, and daring to do so. The Gothic could appropriate the Egyptian Sphinx, should it choose so to do. Indeed the Cathedral has, distinctly, as we have seen, the architecture of the world within it, but then all is appropriated to the Christian spirit, all is one through the faith. Hence, precisely as that Faith can dare to use the bones of the man as the death-emblem, because it knows assuredly that the whole body, soul, and spirit shall rise again, or rather has risen again, so the Christian Church can turn that "abstract," which is the sign of death to the heathen, into an emblem of life and resurrection beauty.

It follows that the Gothic is not yet universal for the world, only for the Christian world. A Grecian building is not out of place in India; the Cathedral would be, because the Cathedral presupposes so much. The missionary church to such a people should rather be the Norman; unless indeed it be necessary for the people of India to become civilized in order to their being christianized, and then the missionary should carry with his schools, the columnar Art of Greece.

We have now, alas, to say, that almost as soon as the Pointed Art came to perfection, we find it beginning to degenerate. The process commenced in the depression of the arch-point—till at last, at the up-breaking which went before the Reformation, it had become only a debased modification of horizontal art. Thus the way was prepared for the great relapse into certain portions of the ethnical Art through which our review has carried us, a relapse which has its grossest, vilest monument and stigma in the so called Renaissance. The church of St. Peters, at Rome, forms its bad glory. That church is the Christian cross overlaid with the Art of the Pantheon. It is a heathenized Cathedral, a carnalized Christian faith. It is one of the most mortifying monuments of the Art. It is the sign that the spirit of this world has overcome the Church.

Let us take that dome of St. Peters. We might equally take that of St. Pauls of London; but the deed was first done at Rome. We have seen through what temptation, what suffering, what long workings the Christian nation at last freed its heart of the world-lines of that imprisoning mass. We found it coincident with a purely spiritual process, so much so that the pointed Cathedral breaking through, and at the same time carrying with it the circular world-line, as the earthly basis of reality, cannot be explained except upon the hypothesis of the Catholic Church at last finding its unity in the spiritual Man, who is the Lord from heaven. How then could Christianity, had it remained Catholic, have gone back to the beggarly elements of the Roman bridge, the Pantheon? We hold, to the sight, that palpable dome of St. Peters, as the transubstantiated degradation of the spiritual glory of the true Cathedral unity, which as it was a spiritual result, though not the less but more an incarnation, yet not for the present seen. It is an attempt to impinge upon the senses, what can only be exhibited to the spirit. We hold, therefore, that the Pope who built that dome, ought to have made his home in it. If the head is to be seen, he ought there to show himself. The vatican palace should be in the dome of the church. And we also hold, that if there be truth in man or in history, that dome must be resolved again—those sad and most backward steps must be retraced, the world-spirit must give way to the spirit of the true unity, access to which in the Cathedral can only be in connection with the re-opening of the dome—both so that the spirit of man can ascend, and the Lord, the Head, come down. The bishop of that church will have to take his seat with all under bishops in the chair, or else that dome, by the very sign and token of its abnormal aesthetic “set,” stands in danger of falling back to its own place, which is this carnal world, as we have already found the Egyptian in a like danger of doing, in its own way, but which was in mercy prevented, even by means of its reformation—disintegration, and better reconstruction, in the hands of the higher nations.

That the unity of the true Catholic Cathedral is a spiritual unity, having its Head in heaven, is palpable to the very logic of the building. Take again the lines which compose the gable, or the pointed arch. They are two—but their sustaining union and relation, have produced a third thing. What is that thing? It is the resulting thought, the idea. How represented? represented in the actual lines, in the resulting composition, but represented to the mind. That third thing, which after all is the main thing, is something felt, known, a created reality—but not seen; if seen, the glory of the Cathedral is gone. If that glory resides in the invisible cross created by the style over the central Tower; it is gone in the attempt at the actual representation of the unity of the style in the solid dome. It destroyed itself in the process. In seeking to represent to the sight an idea, which only remains such for the reason, it fell under the power of the previous element of the logical singleness. To require a man to look up, for example, under the solid dome of St. Peters, and say he sees heaven, is to require an impossibility. One can see heaven through the central tower, because he is in the representative world of the Spirit, which is the true witness of the Incarnation, and by faith he looks and sees all that the true Church tells him to see. But to see heaven through the solid mass of a heathen dome, or rather to see it in that solid mass, is asking too much of man. It is not asking of faith, it is asking it of the overpowered understanding of the natural man, in a way not altogether unlike that in which the Sphinx requires him to be still. It is our opinion, that few men, of late, have gone from Protestant religion to the Roman, upon the ground of the reason or of the spirit, but upon the ground of the overmastered understanding. The logic of the Church of Rome is a fearful thing, and so also is this huge dome of St. Peters, which is the very substance of logic itself. Angelo, the man that made the Moses, was the wild, wilful man to do the work. Probably most men feel something when standing beneath it, and so also most men will feel something under the

architraves of Karnac; but the right Christian man would rather find himself under that arch whose legitimate artistic finish is the cross, (and not the statue) under that dome (central tower) through which the holy safe and spiritual incarnation of the style leads his spirit with all certainty, even as through the waiting Church unto her waiting Head in heaven.

This thing at least we find to be the fact, and it is a remarkable and significant fact—that since the Church of Rome adopted the palatial Renaissance as the palace-temple of her visible head, in St. Peters—that Church has everywhere forsaken the Catholic Christian Art. In Mexico and South America, in our own cities, as well as in the old world, the Roman Church is still throwing up its Roman columns, pilasters, arches, and domes. It does not seem able to frame its speech to the Gothic, even when it makes the attempt. As in the Cathedral of Montreal, the Church of St. Patrick in New York, it will so mutter a little, grow ashamed, and stop. Its architectural doom was sealed in St. Peters, and St. Peters was built when the Jesuit had turned the Church into the papacy—the old Roman power of the crushing will. Far be it from our thoughts to deny the work of the Roman Church, so long as it was the true work of the Catholic Church; but to our view she became sectional at the building of St. Peters, and there we cannot follow. Her great work, her divine work, was the leading of the nations into the safe and glorious place of the Pointed Cathedral, and there we altogether prefer to remain. If another development of Christian Art is to come, that is of the Catholic Church, we are absolutely certain it cannot be by going back to the circle, and the columns of the temple of Agrippa. If the work of the Church is completed, then indeed might this physical return of the Renaissance Cathedral be somewhat legitimate; if the Church is still militant, it is false. The Renaissance has the world-definite lines of the Grecian Art, for the eye, without one spark of its ideality for the mind—what can it then have for the spirit and faith?

The Crusader went forth under the sign of the cross, warring against the world, the flesh, and the devil, on the plains of the Orient. He came back, the saddened and so triumphant palmer; and the Pointed Cathedral is developed. That Cathedral is the militant Church. And thus again reveals its authentic character in the Catholic faith. It is actually true that the effect of the Gothic interior is churchly in this respect; it is that of a certain sadness, that of a careful joy, that of a sanctified sorrowfulness—the work is not done—the mystical Body rejoices to fill up what remains of the afflictions of the True. It represents now the struggle of the whole creation yearning under the cross, and with a holy willingness, yet saying, how long, how long. Whereas the circular dome is a world-picture, where all is defined and set, but in the actual confusion of old elementary origins, not so much as marshalled into the unities of rank and motion. Had the Crusader come back the actual conqueror, he would have been conquered—the kingdom would have been of this world—and Renaissance Duomo, the Museum of the Art of Greece and Rome, would have been his proper representative. As he came with the sanctified lessons of sorrow, toil, and pain, he shows us that the Church is still in the struggle, and he shows us, when he planted his cross above its arches, under what sign the warfare is to go forward. The true Cathedral should make every believer a more serious, earnest, stirring Christian—the dome will cause him to rest contented in the world. The religion of the Cathedral is that which is never satisfied with present attainments, which never as yet imagines the period of rest, which has never conceived of that self-satisfied feeling, which is one of the worst assumptions of the unchurchly spirit. It finds in the Pascals, of all ages of the Church, its truest disciples, and it finds its full warrant for the same in the life and teachings of the Lord.

It is this spirit of a churchly faith which is the especial want of Protestant christendom, and which we believe the good Master is now reviving among many portions of

his people. If the day is to come when there is to be the one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and we know that day is to come, then must each of the great bodies of the now disparted sacramental host, move toward each other. A true development in the progress of the Christian ages does not long proceed in parallel lines. The Spirit now in the world is ever the Spirit of unity. The Greek, the Roman, and the Protestant host must come together, and make one new thing. The patriarch may hold back, the pope may utterly refuse, Protestantism may hear it with scorn ; but we must come together, and we shall. As for us, we cannot in sense or faith, hold ourselves at the perfect reach. The work of the Reformation is still working, we can scarcely have entered upon the forming period. The fact that portions of the Protestant Church have come to a sense of the necessity of re-gathering some of the forgotten elements of Catholic Christianity, is for us a most hopeful token of good. With the view that imagines the Church of the Reformation bore the commission of perfecting in itself the work of Christianity, we cannot sympathize. It is not the way the Lord has dealt with the ages, and the result does not show that it has been other than a tentative process. Much less, of course, can we sympathize with the view that dares to look upon the work of the Reformation as not being the work of the Lord. The man is an object of pity who can look at the Church of Leo, and at the Church of Luther, and doubt if the Spirit of the Master were with the latter. But then we may as yet be but at the beginning of the end. Few great periods of the Church can be defined under shorter limits than five or three centuries. A part of the work which the Protestant Church has to do, in order to the unity of the body, is to draw nearer to the patriarch and the pope, in the fullest reappropriation of the Catholic faith, of which they judge themselves to be the representatives ; and to show them in the spirit of love, that in all respects they are not.

Let us, in conclusion, indulge in a few words as it respects the Architecture of the future. Our review of the

progress of Christian Art to the period of the perfect Cathedral, has shown that while that great building does contain the world's work, the full contributions of all nations' Architecture, even as had before been demanded of the nations for the Tabernacle ; we also saw how the work was principally done through the parallel and commutual instrumentality of forms proceeding from the old world's last two great peoples—the Greek and the Roman. We also found the Roman the prominent element. The Basilica was a Romaic-Greek building. Its columns came from Athens, its arch was made by Rome, the resulting composition was hence far more artistically Roman than Greek. This is the germ of the perfect Cathedral.

Is it possible now that the Cathedral of the future shall reverse the process, and make the Greek element the predominant one ? Here we have to say for the Reformation work, that it is doing something in the Church like that which Greece did for man. It is proceeding upon the idea of the development of personality, as attained through spiritual freedom. In many cases it has gone too far, acted too roughly, as of course every fresh era must do ; has fallen in large portions under the isolating and separating away of dynamic forces, and sometimes has in parts been found in danger of denying the Church, and the spiritual Power in the world. But if there be any truth in history, it is a great work going on under the good and merciful Providence of the great King. Then again, as it respects the probability of Greek Art becoming the prominent element in the Church of the future, we are to remember that that Art has never yet been thus appropriated, for which we have no sufficient explanation, on the supposition that it is not so to come forward. The Greek was the last natural man ; he was appointed to gather up and reconstruct the work of all nations in the behalf of the world for the coming of the Lord. His philosophy has been so appropriated, it did the thinking of the first centuries of the Church ; his literature is so used to this day ; his Art could not be so used because it fell into the hands of executors

who necessarily had no genius for Art. But then the Doric temple does, of all things, represent the Sabbath of the heathen nations. The grand repose of Greek Art is the four thousand years' struggle of the natural man come, in the Lord's mercy for the Church's sake, to its triumphant rest. Is this also a foreshadowing of the development of the Church? As we have in the Romaic Catholic Cathedral the Church militant, are we to have, in a Hellenistic Catholic Cathedral, the Church triumphant, at rest? We are by no means here wondering whether we should begin to build Christian churches in the Horizontal Art; we have done too much of it already. We see no Corinthian capital, we see no circular arch, in the true Cathedral, and yet it is the growth of the Romaic germ. Possibly some three or five centuries hence there may be a Cathedral which can then be equally seen to be the development of the Grecian germ. In the mean time we shall help forward the day of blessedness, by a loving, cordial, and reverent use of the Art which the Church Catholic has wrought out for us. Let us by all means leave for the present, the column and the circle to the world, to the State. The Christian State will also do its work of preparation; let not the Church act consciously in any attempt to originate. It would be the death-blow of every rational hope. It was done in the city of Rome in the fifteenth century, and it so resulted. Let us heartily re-adopt the Creed of the Church, the Liturgy of the Church; and the true Architecture of the Church must follow. This Architecture is capable of boundless modification; it is of its very essence to be so, if true. Let us learn to love it, and so shall we intelligently apply it. We may not build Cathedrals, it might not be advisable if we could. We may build in the pointed Arch, the perpendicular Line, the heaven-ascending Spire, and this is Christian Architecture.

Princeton, N. J.

W. A. D.

ART. III.—THE MEANS OF GRACE.

THE WORD OF GOD, HOLY BAPTISM AND THE HOLY SUPPER.

The following article is a translation of the Ninth Lecture of the excellent little work of Sartorius on the "Person and Work of Christ." It has been translated for the pages of the *Review*, as well on account of its intrinsic merits as because it was omitted in the translation of Mr. Stearns, which was published several years ago. The reason for this omission is given by Mr. Stearns in the following language: "The previous Chapter (Lecture it should be) discusses the Lutheran view of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but is omitted in the translation as inapplicable to the ideas upon that subject held by Christians generally on this side of the water." A writer in the *Mercersburg Review*, Vol. I, p. 162, *et seq.*, (Dr. Nevin) in a review of Sartorius, speaks of this Lecture as a "rich, instructive and edifying discourse," and severely censures this translator for omitting it. The learned reviewer pronounces the omission to be a "glaring wrong" against Sartorius, nothing less indeed than a "downright spiritual forgery, which deserves to be abhorred by all good men."

We have now seen what Christ, the God-man, suffered and did for us; we have become acquainted with the greatness of His sacrifice for humanity, the all-sufficiency of His merit for the redemption of the world, together with the unspeakable love of God to the sinner. Let us now consider how we may come to possess and enjoy those gifts of grace which the Saviour has purchased for us.

Are we to suppose, that, after finishing his work, he left it to mere chance, to extend the blissful fruits thereof—that he gathered a treasure and then left its distribution to sheer

accident? This is in its own nature inconceivable; besides, the Holy Scriptures teach us just the contrary. The Lord himself, during his earthly life, founded *three* institutions, by means of which His Person and Work should be made known to and appropriated by men of all ages. These are the preaching of the Word, Holy Baptism and the Holy Supper. Besides He promised His disciples the outpouring and communication of the Holy Spirit (John 14: 16, *et seq.*), who was to be their Comforter and Helper, and lead them into all truth; who was to move, enlighten and sanctify the hearts of men, and form of his professed followers a Church bound together in faith and love. Thus by means of the Holy Ghost, the Christian Church was to arise and extend itself over the earth, established upon the Word and the Sacraments, as the divinely appointed channels through which the Holy Ghost conducts among men the saving operations of redeeming Grace. In other words, they are the media through which He makes the work of Christ effectual in our souls. Hence they are called the *Means of Grace*. They have been committed to the Church of Christ, in which, accordingly, for their public administration, there exists, as a continuation of the apostolic office, the office of *teaching* or *preaching*. By the means of grace, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, we are now brought to salvation in Christ, in and through the Church. These means of grace we will now separately consider.

The *first*, and most important of the means of grace, is the *Word of God*, in the twofold form of Law and Gospel, or the doctrine of Faith and Morals. The Word, or, which is the same thing, the Revelation of God, in its original, most pure and most holy form, is the Holy Scripture itself, as it is contained in the Old Testament, as well as in the New. It was written by men, who, since they were to be the first, infallible witnesses of divine revelation, and valid for all times, were under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost, whose souls were filled with the clearest light, and the purest love of the truth; as Peter says (1 Peter 1: 21): "Holy men of God spake as they were mov-

ed by the Holy Ghost." The Old Testament contains more especially the Law, interspersed, however, with numerous evangelical promises, particularly in the Prophets. The New Testament contains mainly the Gospel, with which, however, are combined also frequent teachings of the Law, as for instance, in the Sermon on the Mount, as well as in most of the Epistles at their close. The difference between the Law and the Gospel we have seen in a previous Lecture. Christ, whom the Old Testament predicts and foreshadows, and for whom, as the promised One, it prepares the way, and whom the New Testament represents as *present*, is the *central-point* of both Testaments. He is the consummation and fulfilment of the Law, the holy Pattern of all righteousness; He is the living Gospel, the Way, the Truth and the Life, through whom alone we come to the Father; the Mediator, who in his person unites Godhead and Manhood, and by his righteousness overcomes sin in fact. Not simply the doctrines of the Bible, but also its facts and histories belong to revelation; since God has, by word and deed, revealed his eternal power, holiness and grace; and the facts of Scripture according as they imply punishment or blessing, range themselves either under the Law or under the Gospel. In accordance with the counsel of God, Holy Scripture was written far less for the times when it originated—for these times had the oral teachings of the Prophets and Apostles—than for all subsequent times, that the people of God might draw from it continually the divine Truth in its *original* power, spirit and accuracy, as from the purest fountain-head. The object of the Holy Scriptures, as a whole, is instruction and edification unto salvation and holiness, as Paul says (2 Tim. 3: 15, *et. seq.*): "And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith, which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Also Rom. 15: 4: "For whatso-

ever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning; that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope." It is, accordingly, the most powerful instrument by which the Holy Spirit, by means of the Law and its examples, leads us to a penitent knowledge of sin and consequent ruin, awakening in us thus the need of grace and salvation; and then by means of the *Gospel* and its facts affords us comfort and peace in Christ, justifying, sanctifying and blessing us through faith. The childlike simplicity of its most instructive histories and parables, the plainness of its most important and most wholesome passages, the facility with which it is understood, the variety of its contents, all teaching one thing as needful for all stations, circumstances and relations of human life, its living power and force, the dignity and majesty of its language, all these cause it to be peculiarly adapted to the ends of divine interposition and grace.

But as it is the Word of God it must be read with respectful attention and proper self-application. We must keep those doctrines in view prominently which have special reference to ourselves and those histories which illustrate our own character and age, as well as the truths which God designs thereby to impress upon the hearts of men in general as well as of each person in particular. Thus the history of the children of Israel in the Old Testament recounting their manifold wanderings, the ever-recurring mercies and wonderful leadings by the hand of God, will always be a standard by which to judge of the progressive history of the kingdom of God as well as of the life of each individual. In the warnings, comfortings, threatenings and promises of the Prophets we perceive the voice of God addressing *all* nations and all periods of the world. The Psalms give expression to *our* prayers, *our* praises and thankgivings, *our* songs of penitence and lamentation, *our* sighs and supplications, *our* comfort and *our* confidence. So too in all the Gospel narratives we recognize the compassionate love of the Saviour, receiving the sinner, giving rest to the weary and heavy laden, feeding the hungry,

opening the eyes of the blind, and healing not simply the ills of the body, but also—what we are all enduring—the greater ills of the soul. The Epistles are full of instruction, comfort and exhortation. Accordingly a devout and faithful reading of the Bible, accompanied with prayer for illumination, is to be urgently commended to every Christian. Christ himself says (John 5: 39): “Search the Scriptures; they are they which testify of me.” The Word of God, however, is not to be found simply in the inspired Scriptures; it is also at hand in the Christian Church, and in various forms of derivation from this source. As such, we have above all, the oral preaching of the Word in the worshipping assemblies, the catechisation of the youth, spiritual conversation and books of Christian instruction and devotion of various kinds. As among the last mentioned, there are many which are superficial, insipid, and full of error, passing off a sickly sentimentality, and painted virtues for Christian piety, it is necessary to try them by this rule: Whether Christ, very God and very Man, is the centre, around which every thing is made to revolve, and that not simply as an Example and Teacher, but rather as the Mediator, Redeemer and Herald of the Gospel.

We now turn from the consideration of the Word of God to the Holy *Sacraments*, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Sacraments are holy acts (*Handlungen*) of the Gospel, and sustain a relation to it which is similar to that which the sacrifices sustained to the Law. As the Law commands and requires that which man is to do towards God, so it has also its holy ceremonies and gifts which men present to God in order thereby to secure his love. These are the sacrifices. Since Christ himself has offered the most perfect sacrifice of atonement, a sacrifice of eternal efficacy, and of which the imperfect sacrifices of the Old Testament were only types; sacrifices for sin are no longer required in the Church; we are to present only the sacrifice of *Prayer*, and especially that of Praise and Thanksgiving for the blessings of divine grace which we have received.

But as the Gospel does not only teach what God has done for us but has its rich promises besides, so it has also its holy acts, and its gifts which God presents to men, or causes to be presented to them through his ministers, and these are the Sacraments. They are not good works or sacrificial acts which *we* perform, but acts of grace which are done towards us and which we have only to accept. They are added to the Word of the Gospel as visible and confirmatory signs, in order to awaken and strengthen our faith in it, without which it would be of no benefit to us; just as in common life it is customary when a promise is given to join hands or to affix a seal to a written document, not as though something new were to be added thereby, but only to confirm and render more credible the promise which has been given.

Hence the Sacraments are called also the *visible* Word by means of which the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit are yet more specially and impressively mediated than through the oral or written word; for through them the general promises of grace are specially made over, sealed to and appropriated by each individual, which, for his personal relation to God, and the assurance of his being in a state of grace, is of the highest importance. Since it is not in the power of man to promise the grace of God, so neither can man appoint confirmatory signs thereof; just as in human affairs, no subject can, in his own right, institute a token of his monarch's favor. To constitute a sacrament, therefore, a scripturally authenticated divine institution, by which the promise of grace is bound to a visible sign, is required. Sacred acts, which do not possess these requisites, are not sacraments. Sacraments are divinely appointed visible signs and seals of an invisible grace. We Protestants, in accordance with the scriptural idea, enumerate only *two* sacraments, since other sacred acts of the Church, however appropriate and important they may otherwise be, are yet wanting in the divine institution, or the sign appointed by the Church, or the special promise of saving grace.

The first Sacrament is Holy Baptism. This was instituted by Christ himself as a laver of regeneration, to which is joined the promise of Grace; or as Paul calls it (Eph. 5: 26): "a washing of water through the Word" or "the washing of regeneration" (Titus 3: 5). Its institution is found Matth. 28: 19; the promise Mark 16: 16: "He that believeth shall be saved." It is administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, since by means of it we receive the adoption of the Father, the righteousness of the Son and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost; and this indeed is effected through the mediation of Christ's sacrificial death, or his baptism of death, on which account it is particularly held up to view that we are baptized into the Lord's death, Rom. 6: 1, *et. seq.* In consequence of the offence of our first parents, who are the root of the entire human race (Rom. 5: 12)—in consequence of that first sin to which is applicable the words:

"Das eben ist der Fluch der bösen That,
Dass sie fortzeugend Böses muss gebären",*

every man is born with original sin or with the germ of selfishness. (Ps. 51: 5.) This germ is developed simultaneously with man's development, and, the will consenting to its allurements, it bears evil fruits; and without the counteracting influence of divine grace, it must lead man continually farther from God, involve him deeper in sin, and finally plunge him into perdition. Man is, accordingly, unrighteous before God by nature, even before he has committed any actual sin, and is, therefore, in the eyes of men, innocent as a child; but the root of actual sins, the hidden seed of the tares, which is not concealed from the eyes of God, is already at hand in him and renders him unclean before God. It likewise makes its appearance very soon in the selfish propensities of children, which it cannot be said are necessary for their self-preservation; for they are far more hurtful than beneficial. By nature, therefore, man cannot, with his unclean heart, be a child and favorite

* This is the curse attaching to sin, that one bad deed must beget another.

of God, nor can he be a partaker of the Holy Ghost, since he is influenced rather by the wicked and unclean spirit. Hence if Grace did not become interested in his behalf, he would become a child of perdition; as Christ himself says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3: 5.) But the Saviour of the lost takes compassion on him, and scarcely has he entered upon natural life than He meets him with His mercies, and that indeed not simply in a spiritual and invisible manner, but also in the visible sign and pledge of Holy Baptism. It is a washing with water, as a sign and seal that all impurity and uncleanness in man shall be washed away, that is, forgiven and blotted out, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, that the purity and innocence of Christ shall be accounted to the child and that it shall be thus adopted of God who does not desire that one of these little ones should be lost. Hence it is called the laver of *regeneration* (Titus 3: 5); because by it the child, though at first still unconscious, passes out of the kingdom and spirit of the world into the kingdom of God, and becomes a partaker of His Spirit, and is transformed from a child of the flesh into a child of grace. The seal of its original destination to the image of God and to the inheritance of eternal life is impressed anew; and while in the Church of Christ, of which it is a member, all means and helps are furnished for reaching this end. Hence too a person receives in baptism from his sponsors, who represent the Church, in addition to his family name, a new Christian name. The baptism to which Christ, as man, submitted Himself for our sakes, is a visible type of that which takes place in every baptism in an invisible manner; hence we should always manifest the greatest reverence when it is administered in our presence. The Holy Subject of baptism sees heaven open as a testimony that baptism opens heaven for us; the voice of the Father is heard: "This is my well-beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," as an evidence that in baptism we become God's adopted children, and the Holy Ghost broods over the holy transaction in the form of a

dove to testify that the spirit of love, innocence and child-like simplicity is to dwell in the person of him who has been baptized.

The rite of baptism is for the most part indeed administered in childhood; but its power, value and blessing must extend through the whole subsequent life. The objections that some have made to the very ancient practice of infant baptism, proceed mostly on the assumption that the value of the act is confined to the time of its administration. In that case the benefit would of course be greater in the adult; because it is made to depend upon the degree of *faith* in the promises of which baptism is the pledge; but faith with all its blessed consequences by no means requires the presence of the rite, but only the fact of its having taken place, and can find pleasure in it sooner, for a longer time and to a greater extent, the earlier in life it has been administered. Does a man indeed only then become the child of his parents, and does he only then enjoy their love, when he becomes clearly and fully conscious of his relation to them? Is he not rather their child from the moment of his birth, although he does not then know anything of it? Is it indeed necessary that he should be born a second time, in order that in riper years, he may with certainty rejoice in his sonship and the happy consequences flowing from it? Just so does the matter stand in regard to regeneration. Once received into the kingdom of God, the whole Christian life is to be a higher development and continuation of the divine adoption obtained in baptism in the presence of witnesses, whereby, through faith and love, the old man of sin is to be more and more mortified and subdued, and the new man of righteousness is to be more and more quickened in us, as St. Paul says (Rom. 6: 3 and 4): "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

But in order that the covenant of grace, into which,

through the medium of sponsors, God by baptism receives the baptized person, may be ratified and concluded on *his part* also, by an express and solemn vow and confession of faith, the Christian Church, following the apostolic custom (Acts 8 : 4), has instituted Confirmation or the ratification of the baptismal vow. Confirmation is preceded by instruction out of the Word of God ; in the act itself a confession of faith is made and the covenant of baptism renewed ; then follow, with the laying on of hands, the consecration and the renewal of the obligations of the baptismal covenant, to which is joined, after confession and absolution, the first participation of the other Sacrament, that is, of the Holy Supper. Thus in Confirmation, as in the focus of Christian life, all three means of Grace meet ; the Word, by means of the instruction previously imparted, Baptism, in the renewal of its vow, and the Holy Supper, in its first participation. Hence too, Confirmation, although it takes place but once, must extend its benefit and blessing over the whole of our life.

The *other* Sacrament is the Holy Supper. As Baptism is the commencement and implantation of the Christian life, so the Lord's Supper serves to nourish and support it, and hence it is to be repeated, whilst repetition in the case of Baptism is inadmissible. The Holy Supper, was instituted by Christ on the last night before his Passion, and the promise of Grace by which He communicates to us His presence and the benefits of His atonement, is expressly woven into the words of institution, since it is declared : " This is my body which is given for you," and, " This is my blood shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." Christ instituted the Holy Supper just before His separation from His disciples. They were now to be deprived of His personal presence, after having so long enjoyed it, since for the world's salvation He was approaching death. What now would be more natural and salutary than a divine institution through which He promised to them in time to come as well as to all His people in future ages, His presence and the communication of Himself through an out-

ward, visible medium? According to His divine nature he could indeed be always and everywhere present to them in a spiritual manner; but this general and incomprehensible presence could not at all be a substitute for His peculiar and definitely circumscribed presence? Besides He did not design to be present with them simply as God; but desired to impart and communicate Himself to them and take them into His fellowship as the God-man, or Mediator. This He could not do through His divine omnipresence. Hence He instituted in the Holy Supper a peculiar divine-human presence of Himself in the Church, for He says most expressly of the bread of the altar: "This is my body," and of the wine: "This is my blood." By these words He joins His invisible, incomprehensible and gracious presence to the visible and comprehensible elements of bread and wine, so that in the Sacrament we need not seek for it in heaven or elsewhere, but just where He Himself has placed it, namely, in the elements of the Sacrament, in the bread and the wine. Here then Christ is present to us, yet not in a merely outward manner as in the symbol; He imparts Himself to us; in the use of the elements He communicates Himself to us as our Saviour in an inward manner. Even in ordinary life every communication of supersensible objects, is effected through a sensuous medium, and reaches our mind apprehended by sensuous organs. Every thought and every feeling in order to be communicated to others, must assume a body, a word or sign, and then clothed therein it reaches our soul only through the medium of the eye or the ear. Why then cannot Christ be food for the souls of believers when He is orally received, according to His word, in the bread and the wine? He is such in truth. Just as all spiritual blessings are food for the soul, so He, who is the sum and substance of all blessings, is the true food and the true drink of our spiritual life.

This is what He Himself says (John 6: 35 and 51): "He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. . . . I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of

this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." In order that the spiritual fruition of Christ, which is effected by faith, may be continually sustained in us spiritual-corporeal beings, whom every supernatural blessing from without can reach only through a sensuous medium, and when this has been interrupted by sin, can be restored again only under a similar form, the Lord in His condescending grace has instituted the Holy Supper. Here by means of His invisible presence in the visible elements of the consecrated bread and wine, Christ unites himself renewedly with us in the most intimate manner for our salvation. Not as though the bread and wine were actually changed into his body and blood, as the Roman Catholic Church teaches; as little as in the Incarnation of the Son of God humanity was changed into Divinity, so little are the bread and wine changed into the substance of Christ; but here as there the union is inward only; supernatural, it is true, yet none the less real, and true according to the promise of Christ.

Will it be said that that only is true and real which we can feel and grasp with our dull senses? Were those stars, which we cannot see with the naked eye, not real, until they were discovered by the latest invented telescopes? Or does nihility begin there where our senses, even the most refined, end? Is it not the most active powers rather, as for example, life itself, which are withdrawn from all observation of the senses? Is air nothing, because we do not see it? Is light nothing, because it is imponderable? Or is light not present in glass and sound in the air, without glass being changed into light, and air into sound? Why then cannot the Omnipotent Christ be present in the consecrated elements of his Sacrament?

You may say this is impossible; since He is in heaven at the right hand of God, He cannot be present in the Holy Supper. We should bear in mind, however, what has been said in regard to Christ's ascension and sitting at the right

hand of God.* Heaven is not a fixed place, but the unlimited dwelling place of Jehovah, and the right hand of God is nothing else than the almighty and everywhere present power of God. Just because Christ is now sitting at the right hand of God, and because His human and bodily nature is now infinitely exalted and glorified, just on this account He can now be present in His whole person wherever He will; even as we ourselves when we shall be freed from this our chrysalis state, will have a less circumscribed presence than we now have.

It is further objected that the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of His blood is a horrible conception; but the horribleness is brought into the conception by the objector himself, since he apprehends it, as in the case of the Jews at Capernaum (John 6: 52), in a crass and inhuman manner. But there is another way of partaking of a person's flesh and blood, which, although it is still extremely material and sensuous, has yet nothing shocking in it, but is rather the type of the tenderest love; we have reference here to a mother's nourishing her infant at her breast with her own flesh and blood. But the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, is not to be compared even with this, because here everything grossly material is excluded, and only the essential substance of His body and blood is supernaturally received with, and under, the bread and wine. Here then everything offensive and repulsive vanishes, and what remains is only the seal and witness of the greatest and most tender love—that love, which caused Him, in the deepest condescension, to offer himself a sacrifice for us, and now joins us to Himself in the most intimate communion, making us, in the language of St. Paul (Eph. 5: 30), to be "members of his body," who shall be saved in faith and love by having communicated to us His righteousness and all His spiritual gifts.

This, therefore, is that most venerable and most holy

* Vide Lecture V.

Sacrament of the Supper, for which the Apostle (1 Cor. 11) requires so earnest a preparation, because those who partake of it unworthily, i. e., without repentance and faith, are guilty of the body and blood of the *present* Christ. Hence, too, the Church has instituted Confession and Absolution previous to the Communion, in order that communicants may beforehand recognize and acknowledge themselves as sinners, who are hungering and thirsting after righteousness, and receive the promise of Justification, which in the Sacrament is sealed to them by means of the appropriation of Christ and His righteousness. We will not envy those who see in this meal only an outward figurative memorial of an absent Christ, which makes nothing more of Him to be present, than what they may put into it out of their own minds. Such, verily, would do better to contemplate a crucifix or an *ecce homo*, or some other image of Jesus, than to eat a piece of bread and drink a sip of wine, destroying thus the recollection sign in the very act of its reception. Such poor souls are to be compared to persons, who, in an important document or a will conferring great possessions, which is not the mere sign of an inheritance, should regard simply the paper on which it is written, and not the valuable contents, or to those who should throw away the diamond and keep only the casing. But we, as the rich heirs, will hold fast to the holy legacy, whole and entire, which, just before His passion, our bountiful and gracious Lord bequeathed to His believing Church.

Hummelstown, Pa.

M. A. S.

ART. IV.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

VII. MY TRAVELS IN PELOPONNESUS.

C. HISTORY OF SPARTA AND THE MOREA DURING THE SLAVONIAN INVASIONS AND THE CRUSADES.

Different opinions on the nationality of the Modern Greeks—Invasion of the Peloponnesus by the Avars—Slavonian settlements—Description of that people—Their conversion to Christianity and allegiance to Byzantium—Happy state of the Morea—Commerce and industry—Conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders—Otho de la Roche, Duke of Athens—William de Champlitte, Prince of the Morea—Geoffrey de Ville-Hardoin, his bailiff—Medieval Sparta—Keeps the sovereignty by fraud—Successful reign of his sons—Flourishing state of the Franks—Their rapid decline—Byzantine despotism—Ottoman conquest.

In the preceding articles of our Review* I described the localities and still existing ruins of ancient Sparta, and dwelt at some length on interesting discoveries lately made in Laconia of monuments from remote periods of antiquity. Having followed up its history through the times of Roman dominion and the spread of Christianity, I have now arrived at the more obscure era of the Middle Ages, during which Sparta, and indeed all Greece, suffered many vicissitudes of foreign invasion and changes in government, institutions and manners through the intermixture of the barbarian conquerors with the native population.

* See the articles on "Sparta and the Dorians," in *Mercersburg Quarterly Review* for July, 1856, and January, 1857.

As a distant and obscure province of the Byzantine Empire, Greece was rarely mentioned by the contemporary writers of Constantinople. The few scattered, yet important passages, which refer to that country, did not, however, escape the attention of Gibbon. In a few bold sketches, drawn with a master-hand, the profound historian has described the relations of mediæval Greece from the original sources.*

Yet the closer investigation of this subordinate subject did not come within the grand out-lines of his general history of the world through a thousand years. It was not until the time of the war of independence in Greece, when the sympathy of the civilized world became directed toward the Greek nation, so perseveringly struggling against Ottoman despotism, that the question arose among the learned: whether the modern Greeks were indeed the true descendants of the ancient Hellenes, or a mixed Græco-Sclavonian race?

This question having been once started, warm and even passionate discussions could not but follow. Historical testimony was sought on both sides. One party boldly asserted that the present inhabitants of Greece were only Byzantinized Sclavonians; while another upheld them as the lineal progeny of the Hellenes of antiquity—the descendants of Leonidas and Pericles.

As to the Greeks themselves, they, naturally enough, disown any admixture of barbarian blood and repel with scorn any suggestion that their descent is less genuine than their faith *orthodox*. The educated classes in Greece are at present well acquainted with their ancient history, and the many schools and colleges, established in every part of the country, have for the last twenty years exerted a powerful influence on the general education of this lively and intelligent people.

Yet their knowledge of the past ends with the Roman conquest of Greece. The long dreary period of Byzantine

* Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, Chapt. LIII.

rule is to them nearly a blank leaf, only here and there sprinkled with theological schisms and controversies and the legends and miracles of their saints. The Greek knows nothing of the Slavonian invasion of his native country, and he never heard of its long occupation by the Latin Crusaders. Only some scattered traditions from the feudal times have been preserved among the farmers and shepherds of the Morea. Such, for instance, is their tale about the castle of the Fair Lady—*της ωραιας το καστρου*—in Laconia and a few others.

But when the traveler questions them about the turreted castle-ruins of the Crusaders still proudly rising over many a craggy height in the Morea, Attica, Bœotia and other parts of the mainland—they will always return the indefinite answer: that these old relics—*palæokastra*—were built by the Venetians, even in regions which never were occupied by the Lion of Saint Mark.*

Inquiries concerning the Slavonian settlements in mediæval Greece had already been started by Colonel Martin Leake in 1814. This sagacious traveler was the first to observe that many localities in Greece, villages, mountains, and rivers bore names of Slavonian origin, the counterpart of which are found in the most distant provinces of Russia and Poland. This discovery was made more generally known by the subsequent publication of the travels of Dodwell, Gell and those of Leake in 1830, and it now began to attract the attention of scholars to an hitherto uninvestigated period of Grecian history.

In Germany this discussion was carried on with more spirit and learning than impartial and discriminating criticism. The vivid fancy of the German savans and their well known predilection for new, startling theories, sometimes lead them astray. Thus, Professor Philip Fallmerayer of Munich, the champion of Greek Slavonianism, in his elo-

* The islanders of the *Ægean* are better informed, because the Latin Princes ruled in the Archipelago as far down as the middle of the sixteenth century, and many of the natives are still descendants of the noble Venetian and Genoese families, who between A. D. 1205, and 1566, held the sway in the islands.

quent and brilliant history of the Morea, announces triumphantly that the Hellenic nation has long ceased to exist, that it had been annihilated and extirpated since the eighth century of our era and that the desolate regions of ancient Hellas had been re-peopled by swarms of savage, blood-thirsty Avars, and Bulgarians; nay, the enthusiastic Professor goes so far as to exclaim: that not a single drop of Hellenic blood throbbed in the veins of the mixed barbarians of modern Greece.*

The exaggeration of such views, however, is obvious—and soon Prof. Zinkeisen of Leipzig, by proving the wrong interpretation of some obscure passages in the Byzantine historians and contested etymologies of Sclavo-Grecian names, took gallantly the part of the Greeks, while Paul J. Schafarik in his *Slavic Antiquities* brought all the historical materials together, from which at last a more correct judgment can be formed.†

My own opinion, on this question of the contested nationality of the modern Greeks, which occupied me so much during my long residence in Greece, is simply: that in *many* parts of that country we can still distinctly trace the genuine descent of its inhabitants from their ancestors, the Hellenes; while in *others* we discern an admixture of a foreign race, yet even this, so feeble that the national Greek language, the orthodox religion and classical traditions and superstitions have been almost entirely predom-

* Fallmerayer's *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters*. Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1830, Vol. I. It can easily be understood that a work written by a Bavarian, with great talent, but full of bitterness and scorn against the Greek nation, should have deeply wounded the feelings of the learned Greeks at Athens, and that they attempted to reply to the author. The first who, in 1842 entered the lists against him, was Anastasios G. Levkias from Philippopolis, Professor of Medicine at the Othonian University at Athens. Yet Dr. Levkias, though a profound philologist in his own literature, was but a poor historian. His spiteful and bombastic treatise, which did not even touch the ground of historical research, turned the laugh against the Doctor himself. Since my departure from Greece, in 1844, another Athenian writer, whose name is unknown to me, has again taken up the guantlet against Prof. Fallmerayer, but without better success.

† See Zinkeisen's *Geschichte Griechenlands bis auf unsere Tage*, I. Vol. Leipzig, 1832. It terminates with the invasion of King Roger and the Italian Normans in 1146. Most unhappily some dispute between the author and his publisher has stopped the appearance of the second volume.

inant. The Slavonian dialects are no longer spoken in Greece, though there still remain many names of old Slavic settlements. Not a Greek peasant or shepherd, not an islander or mountaineer speaks Slavonic at the present day—their language is the Romaic or modern Greek, which, Hellenic in its character, has borrowed many words from the Italian and Turkish, but few or none are found of Slavic origin.*

This seems to me the surest proof of the victory that Hellenic civilization, language and religion ultimately gained over the Slavonian hordes, at a time of dreadful calamities, when Greece was overrun and partially at least occupied by Slavic tribes. But their conquest did *not* become consolidated; the Byzantine Greeks again got the upperhand and, after a few generations, the Slavi were transformed into Greeks without leaving other traces of their race behind them than their blue eyes and fair complexion, with some of those peculiarities in their dress and manners which they had in common with their brethren on the Danube, the Bulgarians, Vallachians and Servians. This facility of becoming absorbed into another nationality is a characteristic feature of the Slavonian race. Who would suspect that the Prussians, the Saxons on the Elbe, the Wagrians in eastern Holstein and the other Low-Germans of Mecklenburg and Pomerania belonged, a few centuries ago, to the wildest and most warlike tribes of the Slavi—the Borussi, Vendes and Obotrites? It is, therefore, an absurdity to assert, that the mass of the Hellenic population, during the eighth and ninth centuries, were entirely expelled or annihilated. In many parts of Central Greece, in the Peloponnesus and principally in the mountains of Laconia and on the islands of the *Ægean*, the native population never yielded to the invader. They repelled the inroads and soon, by their superior energy, suc-

* Such is the case likewise with the Arnaut or Albanian tongue; it abounds in Italian, Turkish and even Scandinavian words—but has comparatively few of Slavonian root. See the *Researches in Greece* by Colonel Martin Leake, London, 1814.

ceeded in *Hellenizing* the Slavonian new-comers, just as their ancestors had asserted their superiority over the Pelasgian tribes among whom they settled, and over the Persians and other Asiatic races with whom they came in contact, by colonization or conquest.

We find in Greece and Epirus, at the present day, only two nationalities: the Greek and the Albanian, each speaking their own language. The Albanians or Schypetars, forming a million of hardy mountaineers, stand in no relation whatever to the Slavonian race. They belong to the aboriginal Illyrian—or, if I dare to say so—Pelasgian tribes which, from the earliest times, have remained in possession of Mount Pindus and the Highlands of Epirus. It was only in the fifteenth century, after the death of Scander-Bey, that some Albanian bands, fleeing before the victorious Ottomans, sought refuge in Attica and Argolis, on Euboea and the smaller islands of Hydra and Spetza, where they have become bi-linguous, speaking both their own Albanian—*Arnaut* or *Skiptari*—and the *Romaïc* of the modern Greeks.

The three millions of Greeks, of whom one million belongs to the present independent kingdom of Hellas—extend from the maritime cities on the Black Sea, over Adrianople and Constantinople along the Thracian coast of Mount Athos and Saloniki through Macedonia and Thessaly. They inhabit Trebizond, Sinope, Smyrna and other cities on the coast of Asia Minor, all the islands of the Ionian and *Ægean* Seas, Rhodes, Crete and Cyprus. They all constitute one nationality and speak the same language, which, though still distinguished by provincial dialects, remains the genuine, blooming and beautiful daughter of a venerable mother—the ancient Hellenic.

Yet, while I thus deny the total annihilation of the Greek nation, during the storms of the Middle Ages, and vindicate the genuine descendance of the present Greeks from their forefathers, the ancient Hellenes, I cannot but recognize the early admixture of foreign elements which, as I have said—in some parts more, in others less—were en-

grafted upon the Hellenic nation by the Roman conquest and the introduction of the Christian religion, with all the corresponding changes of institutions, ideas, and even of blood. For, the removal of the imperial government to Constantinople, the immense influx of senatorial families, officials and citizens from Italy, of Gallic, German, and other barbarian commanders and their foreign troops, which under the cross-banner of Constantine began to constitute the main strength of the Roman armies—all these, no doubt, extended their influence not only over the new-built capital on the Bosphorus and the bordering provinces, but even over distant and secluded Greece herself. The mild principles of Christianity promoted the liberation of the slaves, who, as cultivators of the soil, were distributed throughout every region of the empire. Nor could the liberated slaves fail to engraft themselves into the native blood of Greece, where they formed, at least, one half of the population, and hence it seems credible that the freedmen and descendants of liberated foreign slaves may have exerted a considerable influence on the language and society in Greece, though they never formed as important an element in the higher classes at Byzantium as they did of Western Rome.

Thus then we discover a remarkable change in the political, social and religious institutions of Greece toward the middle of the sixth century, the era of Justinian I., when the gentile Hellenes of antiquity had melted into the orthodox Byzantine Christians of the Middle Age, and it was exactly at this period that the Slavonian barbarians began from the north-east to penetrate into Greece. The Avars, Bulgarians, and other tribes of Sclavo-Tartaric origin, had already advanced toward the northern bank of the Lower Danube, on their wanderings from their distant homes on the Volga (Bulga), the Kuban and the Caspian Sea during the early part of the reign of Justinian.* In

*The Avars belonged to the race of the Tartars and were often confounded with the Huns. The Bulgarians, though originally likewise Tartars, became later converted to Slavonianism in language, religion and manners. Yet long

A. D., 540, they crossed the Danube and extended their incursions into the fertile provinces of Moesia, across Mount Hæmus to the frontiers of Greece. Somewhat later, about 588 or 589, bands of Avars, united with Slavonian adventurers, for the first time, penetrated through the celebrated defile of Thermopylæ and spread over the unprotected provinces of Greece, which they devastated with fire and sword. They are supposed to have established an Avar state in northern Peloponnesus, which remained independent of Constantinople for more than two centuries.

It is very remarkable, that the only authority we have for so important an event, should be found in a short passage by Euagrius, where he alludes to the Avar invasion of Thrace, Macedonia and Hellas.* It receives, however, confirmation by a synodal letter of the Patriarch Nikolaos, to the Emperor Alexius Comnenus, from the year 1081, which in accordance with Euagrius, mentions the conquests of the Avars in Greece, and adds: that for two hundred and eighteen years—589-807—the Peloponnesus became so completely separated from the Byzantine empire that no imperial officer dared enter the peninsula. Another allusion to this Avar kingdom in Peloponnesus may be found in Paul Diaconus,† where he mentions that the Lombard king, Agilulf, in 602, sent ship builders to the Avar chief, Cakanus, who then armed a fleet to attack the islands, and thus the ancient port of Pylos in Messenia may have received its modern name, Avarino, (Navarino) from the Avars.

Yet notwithstanding these notices are so vague and fortuitous and hardly touch the subject, Prof. Fallmerayer, in his vehement desire to destroy the Greeks, sounds the war-trum

after they had settled down quietly in Moesia (Bulgaria) and become an agricultural people, they still preserved traces of their earlier nomadic habits, and the Bulgar as the "child of the Steppe," remained inseparably attached to his steed—*alogon*—his mute companion.

* Euagrii *Historia Eccles.* L. VI. § 10.

† Pauli Diaconi *Hist. Longobardorum*, L. IV. § 20.

pet in another strain. Describing the invasion, he launches forth in his fiery imagination: "Scythians, Slavi, Slavini, Slaviesiani, Bulgars, Avars, Huns, Alans, Kumans, and other Devil's imps—*teufliche Unholde*—kill, murder and slaughter the entire Hellenic race, to the very last man! Nay they burn, uproot, tear down, destroy and annihilate every city, town, village and hamlet throughout the whole country"—and in this curious style the professor runs on describing with endless repetitions and great detail remote and obscure events of which history hardly indicates in faintest outline.

It was not until the reign of the Emperor Constantine IV., Pogonatus, A. D., 678, that the Bulgarians settled permanently on the rich plains of the Lower Danube in the present Bulgaria, which is still inhabited by four millions of that nation. The earlier Slavonian settlers were thus forced to seek refuge in more southern regions and many bands, no doubt, joined the Avars in the Peloponnesus. In what condition the barbarians had found the old classical country; whether they settled quietly on the desert plains, or the Hellenes resisted and were vanquished with the sword, it is impossible to determine by the total silence of the Byzantine historians. It would, nevertheless, appear probable that the new settlements in northern Greece and the Peloponnesus took place successively, and in part peacefully, and that the Slavi under their native princes (Zupanies) at first possessed themselves of the open country in Thessaly and Boeotia, as it is there and on the plains of Peloponnesus that we still find the Slavonian names of towns and villages at the present day. They occupied Argolis, Arcadia, Elis, Messenia and the valley of Laconia, while everywhere on the coast and in the higher mountains, the Hellenic names predominate. Thus we find the Slavic settlements of Slava, Slavo-chori, Vársava, Vévritza, Vilitza, Kosóvo, Chernagóra, Achova, and many similar—all situated in the plains and on the slopes of the mountains. The cities on the coast and some of the fortresses in the highest situations of the interior, still retain their ancient

names, such as Corinth, Patras, Cyparissia, (the modern city of Arkadhía), Coron, Modon, Vitilos, Prastos, Zaraka, Nauplia, Argos, Epidaurós, and seem never to have been taken by the invaders.

The Slavonians occupied the fertile plains of Greece, at that time mostly desert and abandoned by their inhabitants, who had sought refuge in the maritime cities or in the mountain fastnesses. Of all the eastern Barbarians the Slavi were the only nation devoted to agriculture and cattle-breeding: this is a remarkable characteristic of that race.

Wherever any of the Slavic tribes are met with in history they invariably appear fixedly settled as agriculturists, living in villages and forming their communities. Very likely the Scythæ *Agricolæ* along the river Dnieper, quoted by Herodotus (IV 59) in opposition to the *Nomadic* Scythæ, were *Slavic* tribes of the Scythian confederacy. None of the other Scythian tribes of the Ouralian stock were ever originally devoted to agriculture; neither as Huns, Alans, Tartars, Turkmans, Kalmucks or Magyars (Hungarians). The Emperor Mauritius, toward the close of the sixth century—exactly during the period of their invasion of Hellas—describes the Slavi as being eminently agriculturists. It was the Slavi who taught the Germans agriculture and gardening. At any rate the name of the plough, *Pflug*, in German, (Plug, being the real Slavic name) is of pure Slavic origin.*

Nor is it just to describe the Slavonian settlers in Greece as being a blood-thirsty horde of savages,—or as the Bavarian author says: as hellish monsters and devils in human shape. This is, moreover, an historical inaccuracy; a confounding the wild north-Slavonian tribes, those of the Vendes and Prussians on the Baltic, with the good-natured and lively Servians, Slavo-Bulgars and Slavesini of the South, who called themselves Slavi from the word *Slava*,

* See Russia as it is, by Count A. de Gurovski. New York. 1854. Page 18. They were likewise the great traders and carriers of goods between the distant regions of the Baltic and the Black Sea, for it is settled, rather than nomadic, nations that devote themselves to commerce.

which signifies glory, as the Danes have the *Dannis* expressing the sincerity and excellency of their character.

The Emperor Leo VI, (from 886 to 911) gives an advantageous account of them, for he says: that the Slavic tribes resemble one another in their habits and manners. They all loved liberty and disdained the service of foreigners.* Nor did they long endure the dominion of Byzantium, for they preferred the military rule of their native Zupanies (chiefs), to the milder laws of the Greek empire. They distinguished themselves by their disinterested hospitality, their open, sincere friendship and their mildness toward their prisoners of war, whom they never condemned to slavery (!), but permitted either to be ransomed or to settle down among themselves. Leo then continues in his praise of the beauty, tenderness and chastity of the Slavic women and the faithful affection of their husbands, as peculiar, characteristic virtues of that race. Herds and flocks constituted their wealth; agriculture was their occupation; while they neglected mechanic arts and commerce—for their wants were few and they were more disposed to enjoy an independant rural life than to earn its comforts and luxuries, to which they were indifferent.

This description of the Slavi by the literary emperor of the tenth century, answers exactly to the character and outward appearance of their Slavo-Grecian descendants in our time. They are still mostly settled in the villages of Laconia, Messenia and Arcadia, where I have every where been welcomed by the fine, square-built Slavonian peasants—*choriata*—whose open, round and ruddy faces, blue eyes and fair flaxen hair announce the Slavi. Their pretty women are as stout, frank and good-natured as their husbands. They are not afraid to meet the stranger, but they have none of the softer and more poetic charms of the

* O ye poor Slavi! It was your warriors, *vanquished* by the heavy sword of Charlemagne and his Border-Counts on the Elbe and Vistula, and sold as *Slaves* all over the Carolingian Empire, who as prisoners of war and hence as serfs introduced that word into all the European languages, as *Slaves* (English and Danish), *Slaf* (Swedish), *Sklave* (German), *Esclave* (French), *Schiavo* (Italian), *Esclavo* (Spanish), *Escravo* (Portuguese,) and so on.

Greek women of the islands.* They are pious Christians and the *papas* or vicar, of their village, is their councillor and friend. Their language is pure Romaic, without any perceptible admixture of Slavonian dialects; but their habits and manners of life bear testimony to their descent, and distinguish them from the more genuine Greeks on the coast and the islands. Every traveler in the Peloponnesus will find this contrast very striking. Having passed through the old Slavonic villages, in the interior of Messenia and Arcadia, he crosses the fir-capped ridge of mount Olenos and descends through woody glens northward to Patras and Corinth. Already on the slope of the rugged mountain the names of the villages change from the Slavonic Sebritza, Flamboritza, Stretzova, Chozova, Livartzo, and Kamenitza to the Romaic appellations of Hagios Vlasios (Saint Blaise) Hagios Petros (Saint Peter) Pyrgos and Patras. Here too the modern Hellenes appear in their showy dresses. Their figure is tall and slender; their deportment easy and proud. Their oval face, regular features, high forehead, black eyes, glossy black hair and arched eyebrows, at once announce them as Greeks. They crowd around the stranger and overwhelm him with questions, for they are still the spirited, curious and idle people whom Saint Paul met loitering about the market place at Athens.†

* The picture which M. Cyprien Robert, in his interesting work on the Slavo-Grecian races, gives of the Bulgarian women, is likewise true, when applied to the Slavo-Grecians of the Peloponnesus. "*Les femmes bulgares sont douces, compatissantes et labourieuses. Leur taille est haute et svelte. Elles offrent, apres la femme grecque le plus beau type de femme de la Turquie europeenne.*"

† These observations, which I made during my frequent wanderings in Peloponnesus, and often dwell on in my public lectures, find a pleasant confirmation in the work of a distinguished American traveler, who lately spent a year in Greece. Prof. Felton, of Harvard University, is entirely of my opinion with regard to the distinctive characteristics of the two races, Slavonians and Greeks. "The Slavonians," says he, "are broad-faced, stout, somewhat clumsy: the Greeks are lithe, slender, nimble, graceful. The same features that we admire in the ancient statues, nature still re-produces everywhere in Greece. The intellectual qualities of the races are strikingly different. The Greek is lively, quick to understand, adroit, eloquent, curious, eager for novelty; the Slavonian slow, indifferent, not easily moved to take an interest in any thing, that does not immediately concern himself, and what is more, the traveler in Greece falls in, here and there, with descendants of Slavonians, and other foreign settlers [Albanians and Vallachians]—sometimes occupying an entire village by themselves. Even in Athens there is a quarter in-

Such, then, being the clear, incontrovertible facts, what then becomes of Prof. Fallmerayer's total destruction and annihilation of the doomed Grecian race? Nay, history likewise gives full evidence that the Slavo-Avars of the sixth and seventh centuries did not succeed in forming in Greece so united and powerful an empire as their more northern brethren established nearly at the same period in Bulgaria, Servia and Croatia. Their principal settlements were in Arcadia, Messenia and Elis. That the east coast of Peloponnesus did not yet come under their influence, is seen by the great naval expedition which the Greeks of the *Ægean Islands* and of Eastern Peloponnesus in 727, sent off against the Emperor Leo the Isaurian, during the religious dissensions of the image breakers at Constantinople. New swarms of Slavi invaded the Peninsula in 746; they occupied the valleys of Laconia, which, at that time, by St. Willibald, and other western pilgrims, is called *Slavinia*, *Slavinica terra*, or the Slavonian land. They seem to have lived quietly under their native princes—the Zupanies—who commanded in the different districts. They built several large towns, such as Slavo-chori at Amyclæ, near Sparta, Nikli, a large and populous city on the ruins of the ancient Tegea and Veligosti in the defile on the Upper Eurotas, near the present town of Leondari in Arcadia. Their relations to the Byzantine cities on the coast were peaceful; and for a century and a half the emperors were too much occupied by the religious conflict about the image-worship to send the strength of the empire to reconquer Greece.

At length, in the year 783, the celebrated Empress Irene, herself born in Athens, and the more interested in the recovery of her native country, dispatched her general Staurakios with an army into the Peloponnesus. He at-

habited almost exclusively by Albanians; and not ten miles from Athens there is a village [Suli, near Marathon] where Greek is not understood. Now it is impossible for the most careless observer to mistake these people for one another, either in their looks or their speech, or in their mental characteristics." Smith's History of Greece, continued by C. C. Felton. Boston: 1855. Page 676.

tacked the Slavonians, ravaged their settlements and carrying numerous prisoners of war and other spoils along with his victorious legions, compelled the still independent Slavic tribes to acknowledge the supremacy of the Byzantine empire and pay a yearly tribute. Whether this was afterwards strictly observed we do not know, for the vanquished Slavi seem later to have formed an alliance with the Saracens of Egypt and to have laid seige to Patras in 807, in order to regain possession of the peninsula. But the Greeks of Patras defended themselves gallantly and gained a complete victory over the enemy by the miraculous interference of Saint Andrew, as they believed. A new warlike-spirit seems hence to have inspired the Greeks; the imperial armies made progress everywhere; and when Theoktistos, the general-in-chief—or *protospatharios*—of the Emperor Michael III., arrived in the Peloponnesus in 842, the Slavonian chiefs were defeated and permanently brought back to the allegiance of the emperor.

The Slavi had still continued heathens; now the great work of conversion began. Theodora, the mother of Michael III., had then restored the worship of images at Constantinople and this re-union of the Orthodox Church celebrated its first triumphs by the conversion of the barbarians in the re-conquered province of Greece. Numerous missions of priests and monks preached the gospel in the Peloponnesus with such success, that several bishoprics were established, and many cities, now the centre of Christian instruction, were named after the Saints of the Eastern Church, such as Hagios Georgios, Hagios Petros, Ardreas, Isidor, Hagia Triada (Holy Trinity), Hagion-Oros (Holy Mountain), Christianopolis and others. Chapels of Saint Elias were erected on the summits of the mountains and the newly converted inhabitants peacefully settled in larger communities.

Two warlike Slavic tribes, the Melinghs (Milenzi), occupying the slopes of mount Taygetos and the Ezerits (Jeserzi), who dwelt in the lower valley of the Eurotas, about Helos, after a long resistance, were now rendered

tributary and compelled to pay an annual tribute of three hundred and sixty gold byzants, as a sign of vassalage.

Particularly interesting were the relations of the free Laconians. These intrepid mountaineers who, from the ancient times, inhabited the two parallel ridges of Parnon and Taygetos, and the maritime cities were likewise heathens. They continued to sacrifice to their gods and were only reluctantly converted by the missionaries from Constantinople. These highlanders were by Constantine Porphyrogenitus considered as the genuine descendants of the Eleuthero-Lakones or liberated Helots who, with the support of the Roman emperor Augustus, obtained their independence and rose to power and influence on the downfall of Sparta. Those living on the eastern ridge were called Zakonians (Laconians) and still live peacefully in large and well-built villages, raising corn, fruits and cattle. They still speak a Doric dialect, much differing from the common Româic, and they repelled, single handed, Ibrahim-Pashà and the Egyptians in 1826, during the late war of independence.*

The western tribe, on the peninsula of Mount Taygetos, are better known as daring pirates under the name of Maïnots or Maniates. They likewise call themselves Spartans, though their dialect, on account of their frequent intercourse with Italy, has become more Italianized than that of their eastern brethren.

The rest of the Slavonian tribes, settled in the valley of the Alpheus and in the impregnable defiles of Skorta, like-

*Rev. Stephen Gerlach, the chaplain to the imperial embassy at Constantinople in 1578 is the first of the moderns who mentions the existence of this peculiar dialect. The Zakonians inhabited then fourteen villages on the coast of Monembasia, the largest of these are now Prasto, Kastanitzia and Sitena, lying high upon the rugged coast. They say *κασιμενεμεν* for *καθαμαι*, I sit; *εγαιμενεμεν* for *επειρατο*, I walk; *ποδμενεμεν* for *ποδο*, I sell; *εκετομενεμεν* for *εκετο*, I strike; *γλωσσα* for *γλωσσα*, tongue; *τομα* for *τομα*, mouth; *σιουκος* for *μυα*, nose; *καπα* for *φωτια*, fire; *καλα* for *ελος*, wood; *εξια* for *οικια*, house; *ανθρωπος* for *ανθρωπος*. *Πι ποα κειου*, where art thou? *Οχι ερις εζου*, here I am. *Εγγουνεμενεμ ταν εζου*, let us go home. The Tsakonians preserve several Hellenisms which are not in common use in the other provinces, such as for instance, *ορα*, see! *εραφια*, kids, *αγγαρε* or *επακαρε*, *ροδ εριου*; have you brought, or seen the goat.—They call water, *ου*; grapes, *βορζια*; sheep, *προβα* and others which seem mere corruptions of the Hellenic.

wise surrendered and were converted to the faith of Christ—*nine hundred years* after the first preaching of the Gospel of Saint Paul at Corinth.—A singular fact!

Thus tranquility being restored, the Peloponnesus remained thenceforth, during more than three centuries—A. D. 860—1206—the most pacific and industrious province of the Byzantine empire. It formed a military province or theme—*Θεμα*—with forty cities, among which were Corinth as the capital and residence of the military governor—*στρατηγος*, Sikyon, Argos and Lakedaimonia, a large and strongly fortified city built on the ruins of ancient Sparta. The peninsula likewise changed its name during this period; for the Slavic name of *Moré*, that is *Seaboard*, or maritime country, which at first had been applied only to the western coast of Elis, now began to prevail, and henceforth the modern name Morea—*ο Μωρεας*—has supplanted the classical one of Pelops Island.

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries the quiet and prosperous Morea made a remarkable progress in population, commerce, industry and agriculture. Mulberry groves covered the plains and the silk-worm already introduced in the reign of Justinian I., 555, furnished the means for extensive silk-factories. The celebrated Jewish traveler, Benjamin of Tudela, found in 1152 a Jewish community of three hundred members in Corinth; another in Chalcis of two thousand wealthy Jewish purple-dyers and silk-weavers and—O wonder!—hardly to be believed—a settlement of one hundred Jewish agriculturists on Mount Parnassus!

The Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus among other notices of this time, records a pleasant story, which gives us a lively picture of the comfort, wealth and industry of the Moreotes during these halcyon days of prosperity. A noble and benevolent widow of Patras, Kyrá Danielis, had received a young Macedonian officer, Basilius, into her house during his sickness, and afterward, on his recovery, sent him back to the army with a generous support. When this extraordinary man had become Empe-

ror Basilus I., the founder of the Macedonian dynasty, the widow paid him a pompous visit at Constantinople, where she presented him with a hundred pieces of the richest colored drapery, one hundred pieces of soft woollen cloth, two hundred pieces of linen and one hundred of cambric, so fine that each piece could be enclosed in the joint of a reed, together with rich vases and jewelry of great value. Among the presents were likewise one hundred young Peloponnesian seamstresses and embroiderers, and—I am sorry to say—another hundred of young and handsome eunuchs. I need hardly add, that Kyrá Danielis was well received at the splendid palace of Manaura on the Golden Horn and she left the emperor, by testament, besides immense wealth and precious objects of all kinds, eighty landed estates in the Morea.*

The Moreotes, industrious at home and disliking military service abroad, paid off the conscription of the Emperor Romanus Lekapenus in 935, when preparing for the Italian campaign, with a voluntary contribution of 7,200 gold byzants (or 20,000 dollars) and a thousand war-horses with saddles and military trappings.

During this long period of prosperity the powerful Bulgarian nation had extended their frontiers into the heart of the Byzantine empire, and their unruly and warlike kings made frequent incursions across the sea and the isthmus into the Morea, while another Slavic tribe, the Vallachians, appeared on mount Olympus and soon occupied the valley of Thessaly, which thereafter was called the principality of Great Vallachia.

Yet none of these movements could materially disturb the Greeks, and it is a highly remarkable fact, that while the complete fusion of the Romano-Germanic races was effected in western Europe during the migrations and conflicts of the Middle Ages, a similar process took place in the east of Slavo-Grecian elements, though less complete. In western Europe the Italian, French, English, Proven-

* See Constant. Porphyrog. Vit. Basil. Maced. CX. Gibbon, CLIII. Finlay's Byzantine Empire, Vol. I. Page 302.

zal, Spanish and Portuguese languages arose on the downfall of the Latin. In the east the Slavonian invasions threatened the Greeks with entire destruction;—but they withstood the shock and saved their language and nationality. Some few traces of this intermixture of races, however, still remained and hence we find at present a certain resemblance in the dresses, customs and habits of domestic life among the Slavo-Grecian nations of the Ottoman empire.

These nations are five: Moldau-Vallachians, Servians, Bulgarians, Albanians and Greeks. The Vallachian and Servian are the herdmen of the steppe and the hill; the Bulgarian the ploughman of the plain; the Albanian the klepht and warrior of the mountain and—the Greek the merchant, mechanic and mariner of the coast and the island. The wild and spirited Vallach, the robust and laborious Bulgarian, the idle and fanciful Servian, the crafty and haughty Arnaut and the ingenious and enterprising Greek—all mix together in their daily intercourse like countrymen and brethren, as co-religionists they all alike hate and despise the stupid Turk. The same hope of independence and resurrection inspires them all, and their noble exertions have in part succeeded. Servia and Greece are free. The reorganization of the Moldau-Vallachian Principalities is now the great political question of the day, which no doubt will extend its influence to the hard suffering Christians of Bulgaria.

This happy infusion of the fresh and healthy Slavonic elements into the outworn race of the Byzantine Greeks, now restored and strengthened the empire and enabled it to repel the Saracens, who during the ninth and tenth centuries, after their conquest of Rhodes, Crete and Sicily, became the terror of all the coasts of the Mediterranean and of glittering, luxurious Constantinople herself.

There cannot be any doubt that Greece, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, formed the most flourishing part of the empire, and that it might have kept an equal step in the progress of civilization, if new and more terrible storms

in the following thirteenth century had not at once destroyed this reviving prosperity in its early development. The attacks of the Arabs from the south were soon followed by the still more dangerous invasions on the north by the Bulgarians and the horrible Petcheneks united to other Turkish tribes from beyond the Danube. On the west Robert Guiscard, with his daring Normans, having driven the Greeks from Italy and the Saracens from Sicily, pursued the former into the heart of Greece, while in Asia Minor the Seljuk Turks from the Caspian had founded the Sultanate of Rumi (Iconium) and by their conquest of Niceæa began to threaten the emperor himself in his capital.

It was then that the Emperor Alexius Comnenus called the warlike nations of Europe to his assistance, and that Pope Urban II proclaimed the crusade for the recovery of the Holy Land. That great movement began A. D., 1095. Several of the crusading armies took their route through Greece, which ultimately became divided into different independent Latin principalities. The haughty barons of France, Burgundy and Aragon carried their laws, language, religion and institutions into the land of Lycurgus and Solon, and though the Ottoman Turks put an end to their sway after two centuries, they left behind them many interesting monuments of their wealth and power, which still excite our curiosity at the present day, and of which I here shall attempt the description.

In the year 1204 Constantinople was stormed and sacked by an army of French and Venitian crusaders, commanded by Count Baldwin of Flanders, Henry Dandolo, the Doge of Venice, Boniface, Marquis of Montferrate and a number of distinguished French and Burgundian barons. Baldwin was elected emperor and both the real and imaginary conquests in Europe and in Asia Minor were divided among the conquerors. The city of Constantinople, with a fourth part of the Greek monarchy, fell to the share of the emperor; the rest was equally divided between Ven-

ice and the French barons, who as feudatories held their possessions of the empire with the acknowledgment of homage and military service. Boniface, of Montferrate, having the empty title of King of Macedonia, marched with a small army of French knights through the celebrated pass of Thermopylæ, where he speedily defeated the Greek chief Leon Sgueros of Corinth, who, with more cunning than bravery, attempted to oppose the crusaders. Boeotia and Attica were immediately occupied and given to the Burgundian knight, Otho de la Roche, who resided at Athens, where he built the high Gothic tower still standing on the western ascent of the Acropolis, and became the founder of the ducal dynasty, which, with almost sovereign sway ruled Attica and Boeotia for more than a century, A. D., 1205—1311.

The crusaders now entered the Isthmus and laid siege to Corinth and Nauplia; but Leon Sgueros, being more obstinate in defending his strong fortresses than bold in meeting the French Chevaliers in the field, frustrated all their attempts. During the blockade, to which the Marquis of Montferrate was thus reduced, another band of daring adventurers, led on by William de Champlitte, count of Dijon in Burgundy, and younger brother of the reigning count of Champagne in France, landed near Patras, on the western coast of Morea.

The Greeks, beholding the proud array of mounted knights advancing to the attack of the city, immediately surrendered, as did all the towns of the plain. The count marched to Andravida, a small, but beautiful town in Elis, where he summoned the Greek archons, or nobles and the clergy, to a general assembly. We here discover the condition of the country at that time, by the remarkable circumstance, that the archons and high prelates, being Greeks, abandoned, without any resistance, the cause of the mass of the people, who, no doubt, were mostly of Slavonian origin. They quickly concluded a treaty with the French invader, who recognized, and even extended their privileges and ordered them to join him with their Greek auxiliaries.

It was this flagrant treachery of the primates and clergy, which, in 1205, facilitated the astonishing conquest of so large and mountainous a country by a handful of adventurers; and these same evil passions among the Moreote chiefs, once more brought Greece on the brink of destruction, during the late war of independence. Thus opportunely strengthened, Count William of Champlitte advanced upon Corinth to join the main army of the crusaders. Here untoward news had spread of the formidable invasion of Joannizza, king of the Bulgarians and the imminent danger of Constantinople. Boniface, therefore, baffled in all his efforts to reduce Corinth, and desirous of hurrying to the rescue of the emperor, gladly intrusted the conquest of the Morea to the sword of Champlitte. He conferred on the brave Burgundian the sovereign principality of the Morea, and ordered Otho de la Roche, the newly created count of Attica and Boeotia, to follow his banner as his feudal liege-lord. On his return to Thessaly, Boniface learned the defeat and death of the emperor, in the battle at Adrianople against the Bulgarians, and he himself soon perished in his vain attempts to consolidate his unjust conquests.

Before Corinth William of Champlitte was joined by a distinguished warrior Geoffrey of Ville-Hardoin, who by his eminent qualities, his prudence and valor had acquired great reputation among the Greeks, and afterwards by his skillful conduct became the chief promoter of the successful enterprize of the Franks. At his advice, Champlitte, for the present, abandoned the hopeless siege of the fortresses in the north of the Morea and turned his arms against the more open regions of Messenia, where the poor Greeks, already betrayed by their nobles and priests, had united with the warlike Slavonian tribes, the Melings and Ezerits of Laconia, and the Maniates on mount Taygetus, and assembled an army of six thousand horse and foot in the olive grove of Kondoura, near Kalamata, on the Messenian gulf, where they intended to make a stand. Nor had they long to wait. Champlitte with five hundred

knights and squires, in advance of his army, suddenly appeared in the field. The Greeks again terror-struck at the strange sight of the barbed steeds and the steel-clad knights with closed visors and long, heavy lances, did not even stand their shock, but fled in wild disorder to the mountains, suffering an immense loss in the pursuit. The Franks then stormed the strong city of Arkadhia (the ancient Cyparissia), and other towns, and completed their conquest of Messenia and Elis, when quite unexpectedly messengers from France arrived on the coast, announcing the death of the count of Champagne, the elder brother of William of Champlitte, and inviting him to return to take possession of his paternal inheritance.

The count immediately resolved to leave Morea; but before his departure he summoned a general diet to meet at Andravida, where a highly remarkable constitution was drawn up, a document similar to the Domesday book of William the Conqueror in England, and to that of the Assize of Jerusalem by Godfrey of Bouillon. According to this feudal charter, the entire Peloponnesus, though not one third part of the peninsula had yet been conquered, was divided into ten bishoprics and a vast number of feudal baronies and smaller fiefs, which were assigned to all the chiefs and knights of the expedition, with rich allotments for churches, convents and the religious orders of St. John of Jerusalem and the Knights-Templars. All laymen and ecclesiastics held their possessions by military tenure, and were to keep a certain number of knights and squires in the field. Thus were the Greek chiefs punished for their want of patriotism and bravery; and the Greek clergy, with sorrow and dismay, were now to witness the introduction of the hated Latin rites and worship, the canonical law and the sovereign dominion of the Pope of Rome! This was indeed an astonishing victory of the proud, heartless Innocent III. over the Greek Church. By this unjust and sacrilegious conquest of Constantinople the Pope extended the Roman Catholic sway over thirty-two Archiepiscopal provinces, with more than one hundred and twenty new

bishoprics and numberless monasteries and missions. But this triumph of Saint Peter was not of long duration.

The count of Champagne placed his wise and prudent councillor, Geoffrey of Ville-Hardoin, as his bailiff, at the head of government during his absence, or until the arrival in the Morea of a successor from his family,—with the express stipulation, that the entire principality, with all its sovereign rights, should become the bailiff's own hereditary possession, if such a person, with full powers from the count, did not arrive and deliver his credentials into the hands of the bailiff before the termination of "a year and a day."

Champlitte then left for France, while Geoffrey de Ville-Hardoin, with his feudal army, marched to the conquest of Laconia. We left Sparta, as it stood, on the banks of the Eurotas, in the second century, with its monuments and sanctuaries in good preservation; but its political power annihilated and having a Roman garrison within its walls. A thousand years have rolled on since then! We again visit the charming valley of Laconia—another populous city—a new Lacedæmon—occupies the well-known hills now surrounded by high threatening walls and mighty towers. The whole population, old and young, are manning these bulwarks, are barricading these gates, prepared to hurl rocks, javelins and the terrible Greek fire against the daring foe, who is advancing. Before these walls we see the picturesque tents with the fluttering banners of the Frank crusaders, pitched all along the plain, on which the Spartan women of yore, for the first time, beheld the fire of an enemy's camp, when Epaminondas appeared as the avenger of the down-trodden rights of Thebes! Then Greeks fought against Greeks—now Christians against Christians!

The assault began; but for four days the crusaders, with their huge battering rams attacked the city in vain. The solid towers withstood the shock; the modern Spartans repelled all their attacks and burnt their engines. On the fifth day, however, the besiegers succeeded in battering

down some towers and the intervening wall, and Ville-Hardoin, after a terrific slaughter on the breach, entered the city, sword in hand. The Lacedæmonians at last offered to surrender and the generous knight instantly stopped the carnage and guaranteed them their property and privileges. He held his word.

The site of this Byzantine Lacedæmon can easily be recognized at the present day—nay, it was its high walls here on the principal hill, the ancient Acropolis, which so much excited my astonishment on my first approach to Sparta. The walls and their square flanking towers are constructed of free-stone and mortar; they still ran along part of the four central hills, on my first visit in 1838,—but they have been almost entirely demolished since by the workmen who made use of their materials for the buildings in New-Sparta.

Within the walls—above the large marble theatre—on the open space, where stood in antiquity the Brazen Temple of Minerva Poliouchos—appear some brick ruins of Byzantine churches, which convey an idea of the good taste and splendor of that period. The wide circumference of the walls and the many ruins scattered through the olive-wood in the neighboring plain, give evidence of the importance of the city, which apparently contained a population of from twenty-five to thirty thousand inhabitants.

But this is the last time that history mentions Lacedæmon. A few years later William of Ville-Hardoin, the second son of Geoffrey, and third prince of Morea, after the complete subjugation of the peninsula, transferred his residence to a high rock, in a very picturesque situation, at the base of Mount Taygetus, where he built a strong castle with all the Gothic magnificence of turretted walls, extensive courts and a high central fortress or keep (*donjon*), as his ducal capital. It was called Misithra, and is pronounced Mistras by the Greeks at the present day. The outer-walls and bastions are still in good preservation, and from this domineering position, more than five hundred feet above the plain, I have often at sun-rise and sun-set

enjoyed the most delightful views to the plain below, the distant Laconian gulf and the open sea.

In aftertimes the Greek despots of Misthra, and their successors, the Turks and Venetians, have considerably augmented and strengthened these fortifications, but they were in part destroyed during the Russian invasion in 1770. In 1837, while some of the ruins were removed, a suit of armor with breast-plate and iron-greaves, was discovered beneath the gate-way, and in a sepulchre, at the same place, were found a knight's helmet with its visor, and a coat-of-mail. On the visit of King Otho to Misthra in 1838, the Laconians made His Majesty a present of the coat-of-mail, but though enquiry was made, it could not be ascertained what had become of the helmet and the other parts of these curious relics of the Middle Ages.

The inhabitants of Lacedæmon soon followed the example of their sovereign, and, removing from the hills of old Sparta, they built a new city around the castle of Misthra, beneath the precipices and deep chasms of Taygetus, from which several copious springs descend toward the plain, where they irrigate the delightful orange and lemon gardens and olive plantations, for miles extending through the fertile and happy valley. But it is not only the picturesque ruins of the Gothic castle and the fine views of the plain, which attract the modern traveler. The architect finds here a rich field for design and study. On the removal from Sparta, Misthra became the seat of the archbishop of Lacedæmon, and several beautiful churches and convents were, during the fourteenth century, built on the Eastern slope of the castle-hill in the most romantic sites above the city, situated at its base. Here I admired the elegant, and I may well say, splendid metropolitan church, built in 1341, of white marble and red brick, with cupolas, colonnades and adorned with mosaics, in the best style of Byzantine architecture. In the interior of the church, the columns supporting the great central cupola are covered with inscriptions from the fourteenth century, containing precious documents for the ecclesiastical history of

Greece in that period. They have been copied and published by Lebas and by Buchon, the able historian of the French conquests and settlements in Greece during the Crusades.

In this manner the ancient city on the Eurotas was entirely abandoned. Even its site remained almost unknown for centuries, and it was not until the year 1838, that King Otho, by proclamation, encouraged the Spartans to rebuild their city on the open and airy hills, south of the two former towns; at the same time giving them the hope that a new carriage-road should be opened through the rugged defiles of the Arcadian mountains directly to New-Sparta, and from thence along the banks of the Eurotas to the harbor of Marathonisi—the ancient Gytheion, on the Laconic Gulf. This important work was indeed begun and the levelling of the road finished by the German engineer-officers, during my second visit to Sparta in 1843—but, most unhappily, the revolution at Athens which followed a month later, the dismissal and departure of the foreign officers and the subsequent pecuniary difficulties of Government, put a sudden stop to all such necessary but expensive national undertakings.

We left Geoffrey de Ville-Hardoin, the conqueror, establishing himself and his crusading army in the plain of Lacedæmon, from whence he, like the Dorians of old, accomplished the submission of all Laconia. The rich lands and strong military positions were then, according to the feudal capitulation, divided among the victors and many proud castles built,—yet in order to secure the quiet possession of all Morea, it now became expedient to effectuate the surrender of the four strong fortresses still remaining in the hands of the Greeks, and by their free communication with the sea frustrating the attacks of the Franks. These bulwarks of Grecian independence were Corinth, Argos, Nauplion and Monembesia or Malvasia, the latter an almost impregnable city, situated on a steep rocky island, near the Eastern coast of Laconia and by a narrow bridge united with the mainland.

This place became, in after times, when possessed by the Venetians, well known in England on account of its wine, the strong and delicious Malmsey, which warmed the heart of Sir John Falstaff and rendered even death a pleasure to the Duke of Clarence! Geoffrey, therefore, though reluctantly, resolved to demand the assistance of the republic of Venice, who, with her ever-ready fleets, might enforce a strict blockade from the sea, while the Franks invested the fortresses from the mainland. Yet these military expeditions were suddenly interrupted by a report from France, stating that a French nobleman, with a splendid suite of armed retainers, and full powers from the Count of Champagne, had left France and was soon to appear in the Morea as the successor of the count and the lawful sovereign of that principality.

This was startling news to the barons and even to their Greek subjects, who all admired and loved Geoffrey of Ville-Hardoin, the Bailiff, for his justice, integrity and noble bearing; they all, therefore, by deputations, assured him of their fidelity and affection,—and Geoffrey, being by nature endowed with shrewdness and cunning, as well as with boldness and bravery, resolved, like the celebrated Hernan Cortéz, the Spanish hero in Mexico, to entrap his unwary rival and gain a bloodless victory.

The Count of Champagne, on his arrival in France, had been called to the court of Philip Augustus in Paris, and there retained for many months; it was not until his return to Champagne, that he found leisure to mind the affairs of his Greek principality, and send off, as his successor, his nephew, Robert de Champlitte, a brave, but inexperienced youth. Robert, fully equipped and attended by a body-guard of knights and squires, set out for an expedition, which, at the present day of rail-roads and steam navigation, might be accomplished in a week, but at that remote time, 1207, was considered both dangerous and of a long duration. Robert had, therefore, no time to spare. He started from Burgundy in September—in the eighth month, after the convention at Andravida—and finding the

defiles of the Alps obstructed by snow, he could not descend into the plain of Lombardy till late in October. At Venice, the young pretender was splendidly received, but, under different pretexts, detained nearly two months by the cunning doge Zaini, the personal friend and confidant of Geoffrey of Ville-Hardoin, who had duly instructed him to retain the French cavalier.

Robert de Champlitte at last succeeded in embarking on board a Venetian galley, bound for Crete, but the captain, likewise initiated in the plot, instead of landing his noble passengers on the coast of the Morea, put them on shore at Corfù, under pretence of his galley having sprung a leak. Robert, suspecting some intrigue, was glad quickly to engage a Greek bark, and thus, with some risk, to escape across to the opposite coast. Here he was most cordially and even brilliantly received by the commander of the castle of Clarenza. The Greek clergy, the French garrison and crowds of inhabitants from the neighborhood came down to the sea-shore to offer their welcome to the new sovereign. But the bailiff himself was absent. In order, therefore, to meet him and personally deliver his dispatches, the young prince took horse, and after a fatiguing ride over the highest mountains of Morea, from one place to another, he at last, on the plain of Tegea, in Arcadia, was received by his apparently humble and devoted lieutenant, Geoffrey of Ville-Hardoin, who, at the head of his army and the assembled people, showed him every demonstration of respect and affection, and accompanied him through the defiles down to Lacedæmon, where the city-hall had been prepared for his reception. This artificial pageantry dazzled the unsuspecting youth and his covetous followers. Robert, in the pride of his heart, ordered a general diet of prelates and barons, Franks and Greeks, to assemble at Sparta. There, in full Congress, he placed his letters in the hands of the bailiff, and ordered him to have him proclaimed Sovereign Prince of Morea. Ville-Hardoin, holding the documents aloof, respectfully announced to the French knight, that the investigation of this ques-

tion about the succession and declaration of homage, according to the feudal constitution of Andravida, belonged to the diet—and thus with the assent of Robert, he handed over the papers to the peers and primates, solemnly enjoining them with impartiality and justice to decide the legal question before them.

After a long consultation the diet pronounced that Robert de Champlitte had forfeited his title and right to the principality, having arrived fifteen days later than the ultimate term assigned by the Count of Champagne; they unanimously proclaimed Ville-Hardoin their lawful liege-lord, and immediately, as faithful vassals, rendered him their homage.

Splendid tournaments and banquets were then celebrated during many days, in the plain, on the banks of the Eurotas, for the joyful accession of the beloved duke,—while Robert, with his disappointed followers, returned to France by the way he had come.

The dominion of the French Crusaders in the Morea thus became more and more consolidated, and the Slavo-Grecian inhabitants more accustomed to the yoke of feudal institutions. Geoffrey of Ville-Hardoin, died about the year 1226, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Geoffrey II., who died childless, and then—in 1246—by his second son, the brave and active William Calamates, so called from his having been born in the castle of Calamata in Messenia, the hereditary estate of his family. William, the last powerful Prince of Morea, immediately on his accession, concluded an alliance with the republic of St. Mark, and assisted by her galleys, completed his conquest of the Morea by the surrender of Corinth, Argos, Nauplion and Monembasia. He likewise controlled the Slavonian tribes on Mount Taygetus and the roving Maniotes on the promontory of Tainaron, by building the castle of Misthras—as I have already stated—and several other fortresses on the southern cape and the Messenian gulf, such as those of Maina and Leuktron, the ruins of which I visited on another excursion in 1848.

During this period,—that is about the year 1250—William of Ville-Hardoin, was the most respected and powerful prince in the east. He not only possessed, with sovereign sway, the entire peninsula of the Morea, but on the north, his two liege-men, the Duke of Athens, and the Count of Bondonitza at Thermopyla, defended the defiles toward Thessaly, whilst on the east a third vassal, the duke of Nasos, with his fleet protected the *Ægean* and the coast of the Morea from the piracies of the Turks.

Peace and tranquillity reigned in the interior of his fertile and beautiful dominions. The Greeks were occupied with their commerce and agriculture; the wild and warlike mountaineers were taken in pay by the French government, and formed into light-armed bands for the protection of the interior. The French barons and knights had fortified their feudal estates with numerous castles, the ruins of which, to this day, both astonish and delight the traveler,—and beneath the beautiful sky of Greece they soon found a new, dear home, which made them even so far forget the old, that they now called themselves after the Greek names of their castles; thus, for instance, Hugh de Brienne called himself Lord of Karitena, Robert de Tremouille Lord of Chalandritza, Walter de Rosières of Akova, Ralph of Kalávryta, John of Pásava, and so many others. Yet in order to be truly at home and happy in Greece, the noblemen thought it necessary to get married! Many of the barons, therefore, followed the example of their young sovereign, who, when a fleet of galleys had anchored in the port of Clarenza, having on board Agnes, the daughter of the Latin emperor, Peter de Courtenay, of Constantinople, who was going to Spain to marry the king of Aragon—invited the young princess on shore, and during a brilliant tournament, which he gave to her honor—offered her his heart and hand and told her that a young husband on the spot was better than an old bridegroom beyond the sea. The maiden princess approved of this philosophy, consented, and their marriage was soon after celebrated with great pomp in Andravida.

Such were the pleasant manners in the romantic age of chivalry when a broken lance could win a fair hand! The barons sent to France for their brides, sisters and family, and soon old Peloponnesus became so changed, that it was called "young France—*La jeune France*,"—and a Spanish historian from that time, Ramon Muntaner, says, that the noblest chivalry in the world were the French knights of the Morea, and that the French language was there spoken with as much grace and elegance as at Paris itself!

Not only the French Crusaders found a new field of activity in the east—even the Greeks themselves began to take up chivalrous habits—they became familiar with French minstrelsy—they too tuned their harps to songs of "daring deeds and lady-love" in the celebrated historical poem describing the loves and misfortunes of the gallant Eratoclitus and the virtuous Arethusa. Their chroniclers too sang in artless but spirited verses, the wars of the French in the Morea. It is from an interesting chronicle written by a native Moreote bard in the vernacular language—about the year 1300—that I have gathered these events in a period of history hitherto so little known.*

This prosperous state of the French principality in the peninsula was, however, of short duration. The feudal system and the warlike manners of western Europe could not strike deep root in the east. Without the slightest knowledge of the classical antiquity of Greece, or any sympathy for its modern Greco Slavonian population, the Latin barons considered the country as a conquest, which could only be maintained by dint of the sword; while the Greeks, oppressed by the continual feuds of their masters, soon discovered the real weakness of the foreign govern-

* This metrical chronicle of the Frankish conquests in the Morea, consisting of 9,194 verses, was first mentioned by Du Cange as existing in the Royal Library at Paris. Buchon found and published it in the original modern Greek with a French translation in prose in 1826. This edition is defective; yet from a more complete copy in the Royal Library at Copenhagen he gave a second edition in his collection of chronicles illustrating the French Conquests in the Levant. The poem has many lively passages, describes the events, and furnishes a valuable specimen of the modern Greek language of the thirteenth century.

ment and turned their hopes toward the rising Greek empire of Nicæa. Some few Romanic elements had penetrated the mixed population of the peninsula and the Moreotes had taken a tincture of the civilization of the Franks; but it soon disappeared during the storms of the Turkish wars and thus the ruinous castles, the popular traditions and a few chronicles, documents and dialectic forms in the modern Greek language, are at present the only relics that have survived the conquests of the Crusaders in Greece. William of Ville-Hardoin, in the height of his power and glory, imprudently joined the despot of Epirus, Michael II. in his war against the Greek emperor of Nicæa. With his whole force he entered, in 1259, the highlands of Macedonia, where he was totally routed at Perlepi and captured at Castoria, while flying in disguise from the battle field. The Prince of Morea was carried in triumph to Nicæa and could only, after prolonged negotiations, obtain his release by surrendering three of the most important fortresses of his principality, Misthras (Sparta), Monembasia and Maina, into the hands of the Emperor Michael Palæologos, who in the meantime had re-conquered Constantinople and restored the Greek empire in Europe.

The entire province of Laconia having thus reverted to its native prince, the Greeks rose in arms against the French feudatories, and united to the Byzantine forces, invaded the plain of Elis and advanced upon the capital of Andravida. William of Ville-Hardoin and his French barons, though hardly pressed by insurrection on every side, displayed all the romantic bravery of this chivalrous period. In a brilliant cavalry combat at Prenitza, in the valley of the Alpheus, they defeated the Byzantine army; and following up their advantage, they, a second time, routed them in the defile of Makriplaghi on the frontiers of Messenia, where the imperial generals, Philes and Makrinos were taken prisoners, and the whole open country, as far as Helos and Monembasia, was ravaged with fire and sword by the victorious army of the Franks.

Yet William of Ville-Hardoin soon felt the fatal blow

which had prostrated his power. The valor of the Franks could not, in the long run, withstand the incessant attacks of the Byzantine emperor, supported by the dissatisfied Greek population of the Morea—and their dominion would, in 1267, have come to a rapid close, if the Prince of the Morea had not found a new and powerful ally in the Angevin dynasty of Naples. William of Ville-Hardoin died at Kalamata in 1277, and his sovereignty passed, with the hand of his daughter Isabella, to Philip of Anjou. The princes of the house Anjou-Naples governed their principality of Achaia by lieutenants, or baillies, mostly chosen among the most influential feudatories of the peninsula. Zacharias Centurione, baron of Chalandritza, the last prince of Achaia, surrendering his possessions to the Byzantine despot Thomas Palaeologos, in 1430, terminated the line of the Frank sovereigns, who had possessed the Morea during two hundred and twenty-five years. The endless contentions between the nobles themselves, their feuds with the Byzantine despots who governed the southern provinces in the name of the emperor, the incursions of the Catalan freebooters from Attica, and later, of the Turkish pirates from Asia Minor, had impoverished and devastated that unhappy country, whose mixed population of Franks, Greeks, Slavonians, Albanians, Gipsies and Jews, demoralized and without valor and patriotism, fell an easy prey to the sword of Mohammed the Conqueror, in 1460.

A. L. K.

Lancaster, Pa.

ART. V.—THE INNER LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN.

THE INNER LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN. By Rev. Frederick A. Rauch, D. D., First President of Marshall College; and author of "Psychology, or a view of the human soul." Edited by Rev. E. V. Gerhart, President of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1856.

As a general thing, books of sermons are not popular. There is a quiet and strong prejudice against them. That the publication of the Gospel, the exposition of the Scriptures, the inculcation of Christian duties, and the exhibition of Christian principles, have their legitimate place and range in sermons, and are successful through the medium of the living voice as they cannot be otherwise, is a deep and general persuasion. The very fact that sermons have their power in connection with the living voice, and the living sympathy existing between the preacher and his audience, and that, if rightly prepared, they are produced with a view to this end, is itself an evidence that, as a general rule, they cannot hope to succeed as publications. As a flower fast to the living stem, is blooming, and fresh, and fragrant there, but begins to lose all these as soon as sundered from the plant in which alone it is the true flower; so sermons have life, power, and beauty only as they live and breathe in union with the living preacher and the living audience.

It was a just remark once made by a learned Professor in the Theological Lecture room to the effect that in no department is there so much useless literature as in that of printed sermons. This remark, the justice of which we felt, and the recollection of which has lingered with us through a number of years, we have frequently seen verified. Though we always knew that the name of such books

is Legion, yet were we convinced, on a late occasion, in the examination of an extensive private library, that we had never reached "the full extent of the mighty argument." We felt like the queen of Sheba, when she came to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and found that "the half had not been told," for we saw clearly that the books and sermons "exceedeth the fame which we had heard."

It is found, too, that the laity seldom buy sermon books. However fond they are of hearing sermons, their interest in them generally ceases beyond that. It not unfrequently happens that a pastor preaches a sermon by which the people are greatly benefitted, and with which they are highly delighted. They desire its publication. The pastor is pleased with the compliment, and it is the most commendable feeling which leads him to desire that it may do good also in the printed form. He yields to the kind request, and publishes it—on his own responsibility, as to the expense. In due time fifty or one hundred copies are sold; six or eight hundred are left on hand, and he is nine tenths of their cost out of pocket. It is just the same with sermons delivered on other public occasions. It is an illustration of the fact that men do not read, but only hear sermons. Sermons are sermons, not pamphlets or books—as sermons they are beyond all price, as books and pamphlets they are often only so much paper and ink. Sermons that once delighted an audience, moved them as a forest is shaken by a mighty wind, called dead sinners to life, and opened fountains of strength and consolation to saints, have been sold as pamphlets—loads of them—for wrapping paper at three cents a pound.

True, though the laity seldom buy sermon books, they are bought nevertheless; and a volume that can command the whole land as market, will often run through several editions. This fact, however, only points to a greater evil. They are purchased by ministers. While there is truth in the sentiment that a sermon is much enriched by the gold of many sermons on the same subject, and also in the saying, "that it makes no difference where one gets the club

only so the devil receives a heavy blow ;" yet it is true also, that many ministers injure their minds, lose their habits of earnest study—which alone, with the blessing of God, can make a fresh preacher—and turn their minds into a mere receptacle of other men's thoughts—a granary, instead of a garden. Whatever may be the excellency of a sermon's outward form, it has no soul if it be not the true product of the mind and heart of the one who delivers it. Between a sermon that grows fresh out of mind and heart, and one constructed after the manner of eclectic compilation, there is as great a difference, and a similar one, to that between water that gurgles out of the sand beneath the rock and water that rushes from a spout after it has flowed through pipes intervening between it and the fresh fountain. In both cases it is water—looks alike—but how different to him who tastes it !

We have a book of sermons before us ; and we hope the candid acknowledgments which we have made in regard to this species of literature in general, will convince the reader that we come to its review with no prepossessions in favor of the department of books to which it outwardly belongs. Thus we have a right to ask that due weight be also given to whatever praise we may feel constrained to bestow upon it. There are exceptions to all rules—and sometimes they are so formidable, as to trouble us exceedingly in regard to the rule itself, even though its truth may be clear as a demonstration. This is the case with the book in hand.

We are heartily glad that the nice taste and just discrimination of the Editor did not allow him to call the book "Rauch's Sermons ;" but led him to entitle it "*The Inner Life of the Christian.*" We can easily see, after attentively studying the contents, how he was forced to the title—bound to it by the spirit of the book. Though every discourse in it is a sermon, and was delivered as such, yet it would be really unrighteous to label the book "sermons," and put it on the shelf by the side of volumes that go by this name ; because the outward sameness would not indi-

cate the true and vast difference which actually exists. Though the book is not a whole, as an author would have made it who had selected "The Inner Life of the Christian" as a subject, and written a treatise on it; yet there was a wholeness and a systematic mode of thinking in the Author's mind out of which all his sermons grew—his heart and mind moved in the inner life of Christianity and piety; and the Editor, in making and arranging his selections, has made the book approximate very nearly to a treatise, so that there is in it a principle, a soul, a progress, and an end, which fully justifies the title: "The Inner Life of the Christian." As the landscapes through which a traveler passes—the hills, and mountains, the plains and valleys, the woods and fields, the streams and fountains, the plants and trees, the insects and birds, indicate to him at any time his geographical location, and his progress toward a given point; so in this book is the reader aware of his progress from the moment when he starts in the first discourse with "The Principle of the Inner Life," till he feels himself wrapt up in "The Final triumph of the Inner Life" in the last, and is ready to exclaim with Simeon, in holy joy, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

The Author of these discourses was well at home in the true nature, power, and proprieties of language, and possessed a most delicate taste for the terseness and tenderness of style. Though he had never so mastered the idiomatic details of the English language as to be entirely proof against the intrusion of occasional Germanisms, yet was the basis of his style such as to show him master of all its fundamental principles, and of unfolding, in a remarkable degree, its power and beauty. The case required only some gentle touches from the hand of the Editor, principally, as he himself informs us, among the "particles and phrases," to remove "traces of the German idiom." As it stands we hesitate not to pronounce the language of this book English that is rarely excelled. Indeed it is surprising that a man as familiar with Latin and Greek as he was,

and writing in a language newly and later learned, should not have afflicted his style by the transfer of foreign words, and that he should have so sparingly used those words of Latin and Greek origin which are already at home in English. There is not one book in twenty now published that will compare with it in its Saxon purity and beauty.

Dr. Rauch was a philosopher. The possession of marked ability in this sphere of science has been awarded him by the scientific public, as is evident from the favor with which his work on Psychology has been received. In it he came before the public as an author unknown, and by it he has from that time been well known—the book having silently and steadily passed through a number of editions; nor to this day are earnest, enquiring scholars weary of it. Not dogmatically nor ostensibly, but in a subdued tone, there is a sounding in the depths heard also throughout these discourses. It is this that gives compactness, clearness in distinctions, and firm logic to every discussion—relieving arguments and illustrations from weary and troublesome digressions, and from all redundances of language. Useless words, sentences, and paragraphs are hard to be found.

Dr. Rauch was an humble Christian. If he had not been this he could not have been the last. It is faith that leads into the depths. It is the only "evidence of things not seen." It is the only power that truly penetrates beneath the temporal, material, sensational surface. What the Poet so beautifully describes as the upward process of our imaginative powers from childhood to manhood—which, however, he would have us to know, is, if not sanctified by a higher life, in truth a downward process—is just as true in regard to the process from simple faith toward the self-confident ripeness and firmness of natural reason—

Heaven lies about us if our Infancy!

Shades of the prison-house begin to close

Upon the growing Boy

At length the Man perceives it die away,

And fade into the light of common day.

The childlike in Christianity is the deep and fresh; that which assumes the air of what is called the manly, is the shallow and naked. The humble shall be exalted. The fools are wise. The wise and prudent grope in darkness, but the lips of babes shall speak wisdom. We must receive the kingdom of God as a little child. The Christian heaven, with all its divine poetry, with all its transcendent glory, and with all its vigor of eternal life and bliss, lies nearest to us in our gracious infancy. The intentions of the humble reach deeper into the sublime mysteries of faith than the deductions of reason. Not only the best men, but the wisest men, have been the most childlike. To speak of no other, let us remember John and Jesus Christ. In them the divine came into the human—in Christ as source, into John by transmission. Never did infancy lay more confidently upon a mother's bosom than did Christ upon the bosom of the Father, and John upon the bosom of Christ. The discourses which we are reviewing, with all their profoundness of philosophic thought, speak of the things of the kingdom in the spirit of the most childlike faith and simplicity. What to the child, happy among its playthings, are kingdoms, monumental honors and the wealth of "merchants that are princes?" What to the Author of these discourses are depths and heights of what the world calls wisdom, while he sits at Jesus' feet and learns words and thoughts which no eternity can exhaust? "I shall prove in a few words," is the language of one of his propositions, that the connection between Christ and his Children, between the Visible and Invisible, does not exist for reason." Again, "reason places men indeed at the summit of a fallen creation, but it cannot raise him beyond it." "Nothing can lead us to true greatness in life but humility." The book is full of this sentiment. To him reason and nature are dark and narrow, faith is bright and wide. Only faith can open avenues to a higher and wider world. Only by it, and in it, can the human spirit come to its full flower and fruit.

There are certain modes of thought and of illustration

which are favorites with the Author, and which run like golden threads through every discourse. What we have just designated is one of these. At apparent variance with this, but truly one with it in the deepest harmony is another. There runs through these discourses an earnest protest against unbelief. He seems always to have unbelievers, or sceptics in his eye, and he seems laboring to fortify faith against the quiet suggestions of scepticism. This can be accounted for. He knew rationalism. He had felt it. It breathed around the Universities where he studied. It lived—or perhaps better, it lay in calm and dead repose in the text books through which extended his educational course. Though it never entered his inmost life, it had looked particularly upon his mind and heart; and as in Solomon's representation of Zion's daughter, who though pure as heaven within, was nevertheless outwardly sunburnt, so as to look dark as Kedar's tents, so some shadows of the old spirit, so foreign to his own deep religious life, were ever passing over his spirit. While his inmost spirit earnestly protested against these spirits cast out, but not banished from view, he could also not divest himself of the fear that the more inexperienced life of the students to whom he preached might fall into the power of the same seducing spirits. It must not, therefore, be supposed that this steady habit, apparent in these discourses, of confirming the truth of Christianity against the suggestions of philosophic unbelief betrays any weakness in his own faith, or is to be regarded as the whistling of a timid one past the grave yard to keep up his own faith and Christian courage. The very ground from which he evermore opposes the spirit of unbelief, proves that no weakness in his own faith led him into it. Only when he has led us to a ground and position higher than reason and nature, does he point down, and ask us to see how far and dreary below lie the cold and bleak plains of unbelief. Hear him: "What is faith? He who has it, will but rarely inquire into its nature; and he who has it not, cannot understand it." "What is faith? is difficult to be answered, not because we cannot give a

definition of it, but because the best definition will not give him an idea of faith who does not possess it." What is this but the deep and glorious truth which, not reason and nature, but only faith can reach; the secret of God is with them that fear him, and he will show them his covenant. In thy light shall we see light. I will give you of the hidden manna. The meek will he judge in judgment; the meek will he show his way. He that will do my will, shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God. To as many as receive him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God. All of which is so beautifully said in the motto of this Review: I do not seek to know that I may believe; but I believe that I may know.

Dr. Rauch had a strong organ and a fine taste for the aesthetical, as this book abundantly shows. Though extremely fond of the beautiful in the ancient classical archaeology, he always kindles into a holy enthusiasm in the presence of the beauties of those creations called forth by Christianity. Indeed it is with him a favorite mode of recommending and exalting Christianity to compare its aesthetical features with the highest of similar exhibitions in all other religions. In the same way, it is common with him to contrast Christian with Pagan ethics, to show how infinitely the true and the right in Christ exceed the highest conceptions of the best paganism, or the more modern endeavors of merely natural men.

His discourses abound also in what may be called the parabolic. The lower world of nature, in all its kingdoms, perpetually illustrate the higher, supernatural world. He has ever the truth of the poet's lines before him:

"What if earth

Be but the shadow of Heaven and things therein.

Each to other like, more than on earth is taught."

His illustrations of divine truth from the world of nature are many, and beautiful, and often strikingly apt and original. This gives a freshness and a charm to all his discussions.

There prevails also in Dr. Rauch's mode of preaching

the habit of deducing doctrines, duties and privileges from the facts—historical and miraculous—of the Holy Scripture. He feels that there is something deeper than doctrines and precepts—namely a divine life, which ever reveals itself first, and in its deepest sense, in facts and history. Hence he rarely takes a preceptive or doctrinal text, but often a fact, miracle, event, from which he educes truth, doctrinal and preceptive, with freshness, force, and beauty. The prominence of this feature in these discourses had much to do, as we believe, with suggesting to the Editor the title, "*The Inner Life of the Christian*;" and well illustrates its appropriateness. It is this also which, with all the depths and learning which every discourse betrays, makes them interesting to the reader unused to scientific theological discussions in the more abstruse departments, and thus admirably adapts the book to the earnest enquiring laity.

As a conclusion of the whole matter, we are disposed, as the result of careful reflection, to commend "*The Inner Life*" to all earnest persons as a book to make one think and to make one wise. It ranks high above the ordinary run of sermon books. Those especially who have read the Author's *Psychology* ought to read these discourses, to see with what childlike faith and pious fervor the deep and earnest metaphysician speaks of the glorious things of the kingdom; and that they may behold in it an illustration of the fact that true greatness is at the same time true humility.

The work is very properly introduced by an excellent Preface from the pen of the Editor, Prof. E. V. Gerhart, in which we are furnished with some account of Dr. Rauch's life and labors, and also of the part performed by the Editor in the work presented to the public. All is well done; and those who cherish the memory of the learned and pious Author have reason to be thankful that, in the publication of these sermons, both the Editor and publisher have done their work with so much taste, reverence, and success.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

ART. VI.—FANCY, WIT, AND COMMON SENSE.

Phantasia, das ungeheure Riesenweib,
 Saß zu Berg;
 Hatte sitzen neben sich zum Zeitvertreib
 Wiß, den Zwerg.
 Der Verstand
 Seitwärts stand,
 Ein proportionirter Mann,
 Sah das tolle Spiel mit an.

Phantasia sich halben Leib's zum Himmel hob,
 Einen Stern
 Faste sie und schwang ihn, daß es Funken stob
 Nah und fern.
 Fiel der Wiß
 Wie ein Blüß
 Drüber her, und faßt den Schein
 In die kleinen Taschen ein.

Phantasia zur Wolke, die vorüberflog,
 Streckt die Hand,
 Sich die Wolke purpurn um die Schultern zog
 Als Gewand.
 Wiß versteckt
 Drunter steckt,
 Wie sich nur ein Fältchen rückt,
 Wiß heraus mit Lachen guckt.

Phantasia mit Donnersturm thut auf den Mund
 Wiß verstummt;
 Schweigt die Riesen, thut sogleich der Zwerg sich kund
 Pfeift und summt.
 Der Verstand
 Hält nicht Stand,
 Geht und spricht: Das mag ich nicht;
 Denn das sieht wie ein Gedicht.

Friedrich Rückert.

TRANSLATION.

FANTASY, the giant goddess, sat sublime
On a height,
Had beside her standing to beguile the time
WIT, the sprite,
Not far thence,
COMMON SENSE,
Quite a well-proportioned man,
Watched until the play began.

FANTASY half reared her body to the sky,
And a star
Plucked from thence and whirled it, making sparkles fly
Near and far.
Down fell WIT,
Where they lit
On the ground—the shining dust
In his little pockets thrust.

FANTASY, to clouds that swiftly o'er her flew
Stretched her hand;
Robe-like round her shoulders purple mists she drew
Full and grand.
Under slid
WIT and hid;
Where a gaping fold was seen,
Out he peeped with laughing mien.

FANTASY in thunder-tones sent forth her word;
WIT was mum.
When the goddess ceased to speak, the sprite was heard
T' pipe and hum.
COMMON SENSE
Took offence,
Turned and said: Too much for me!
For it looks like *poetry*.
Lancaster, Pa.

T. C. P.

ART. VII.—THE REFORMER, JOHN DE LASKY.*

"Legitimus et ecclesiasticæ et politicæ disciplinæ usus est nervus totius ecclesiastici regiminis."—JOANNES A LASCO, 1556.

JOHN DE LASKY, the founder and organizer of the Reformed Church in East Friesland, the Netherlands, the lower Rhine, and in England, and the Reformer of Poland, descended from one of the most prominent and wealthy families among the nobility of Poland. He was born in Warsaw in 1499, and was a nephew of the primate of the realm, the Archbishop of Guesen. Endowed with a strong mind and a resolute spirit, the advantages of his birth and education contributed to the formation of a manly, independent, and noble character, that was illustrated in all the leading acts of his eventful life.

After completing his preliminary studies in Poland, De Lasky went abroad, in 1523, according to the custom of the times, and visited the celebrated schools of Lyons and Basel. At Lyons, he formed an intimate and lasting friendship with Albert Hardenberg, subsequently court-preacher to the Archbishop of Cologne, and the Reformer of Bremen. In Zurich, he became acquainted with Zwingli, and took ground against him on the necessity of a Reformation. In opposition to the authority of the Roman Catholic Church and of the popes, which Lasky maintained, Zwingli referred him to the teachings of the Sacred Scriptures, of which, up to this time, he had but little knowledge. These discussions produced an ineffaceable impression upon him. But he did not yet possess very deep and clear views of Christian truth. Repairing to Basel, 1525, he became the guest of the great Erasmus, for several months in succession, and by him was won decidedly for Christ and the

* Composed from *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphaelischen evangelischen Kirche*, von Max Goebel, 2 vols.; *Life and Times of John Calvin* by Henry; *Mosheim's Church History*; *Kirchengeschichte* von Dr. Karl Hase; *The History of the book of Common Prayer*; and *The History of the Church in Denmark* by Herveg.

science of theology. A warm mutual attachment sprang up between them. Lasky's method of thinking, in theology, was moulded by Erasmus, whose disciple, in this respect, he continued to be to the end of his life; and when, subsequently, he went beyond this great theologian, in deep religious knowledge and Christian experience, he nevertheless adhered to the system of doctrine as taught by Zwingli and the Zurichers. Erasmus, on the other hand, was captivated by the extraordinary learning, and especially by the amiability and spotless morality, of his young friend; and, at a later period, freely acknowledged his great indebtedness to this young man. "He is a pattern for all," said he. "I, an old man, have been made better through my intercourse with this youth. The sobriety, moderation, modesty, chastity, and purity, which he ought to learn from me, an old man, I have learned from him."

At Basel, Lasky also enjoyed the instructions of Pellicanus, professor of Hebrew, and of Ecolampadius, whose simplicity and piety were a source of great spiritual good to him. Besides, at Zurich, he formed a very intimate acquaintance with the most influential disciple and follower of Zwingli, Henry Bullinger, whom he highly esteemed, in view of his simplicity in doctrine and moderation in controversy; yet freely counselled him to use a still greater degree of mildness, especially towards Luther.

This season of literary and Christian fellowship with kindred spirits, was broken up (1525) by an order from his parents and the court of Poland, requiring him to visit France and Spain, on State affairs, and then return home. Thus, after an absence of about three years, Lasky came back to Poland, in 1526, a decided and intelligent adherent to the new and liberal views of Erasmus; who held, however, "that it was more judicious to abide by the Church and her doctrines, notwithstanding her objectionable features, than to introduce doubtful innovations." Sharing this view, Lasky, with all his love of pure Christian doctrine, could enter the service of the Roman Catholic Church of Poland with a good conscience; indulging the hope that,

in this way, he could the more easily infuse the power of evangelical truth into his native country. First, he became provost of Gnesen ; afterwards was promoted to several other important benefices ; but he could not succeed in bringing about the gradual reform of the Church for which he labored. Disappointed at this result, the yoke of Pharisaic self-righteousness of the Romish Church became more burdensome ; and the ungodly and disgraceful lives of his associates in office filled his heart with a deeper sorrow. At length, after losing ten years of his life, as he says, he broke away from all the dangerous entanglements, and turned his back upon the brilliant prospects which lay before him. He refused the bishopric of Cujavien, which was tendered him, declared himself in favor of a thorough evangelical Reformation, and bid adieu to his beloved fatherland, "until he would be recalled, not to lead a life of ease, or to enjoy the high honors of a bishop, but to serve God truly, in the Gospel of His Son." Then, at the age of ripe manhood, of commanding influence, and having received honorable testimonials from the king, he departed (1537), and, for a period of *nineteen* years, devoted himself, with indetatigable zeal and unchanging fidelity, and amid great self-denial, to the establishment of the Reformed Church in East Friesland, England, and Germany.

Lasky first visited his old friend, Albert Hardenberg, who was then at Mainz. At Lyons, in 1539, he married a pious girl, without wealth, from the common class of society. She proved to be an excellent and congenial companion, with whom he led a happy life for thirteen years, and had several children. In 1553 he married a second time, and was equally blest in the selection of a help-mate.

From Lyons he removed to East Friesland, in 1540, and purchased an estate in the vicinity of Emden, where he expected to live in retirement. Here commences the most important period of his public career in the service of the Reformed Church.

East Friesland, bounded on the east by Oldenburg, on

the north by the North Sea, and on the west by the North Sea and the Netherlands—the southern limit it is difficult to define, on a modern map—has, since the year 1815, been incorporated into, and now constitutes the western territory of, the kingdom of Hanover. At the time of which we are speaking, it was a separate Duchy or County; but had, by inheritance, become subject to the jurisdiction of the Duke of Oldenburg. The Duke, more liberal and generous than his fellow rulers on the continent, allowed East Friesland to retain the civil and religious liberties by which it had for centuries been distinguished. It had even withstood, for a long time, the iron power of the Romish Church. At the period of which we are writing, it was the only State in Germany where a certain measure of religious toleration prevailed; and to which, in consequence, the persecuted among the kindred nations of West Friesland and the Netherlands—the Reformed, nicknamed Sacramentarians,* Anabaptists, and Lutherans—fled for refuge. The Reformation as originally introduced, in 1526, by George Aportanus, the tutor of the family of the Duke, and subsequently pastor in Emden, was of the Erasmo-Zwinglian type—a wooden table, instead of the altar, having been used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and common white bread, which was broken and handed to each communicant; an innovation that, at the time, produced an extraordinary excitement throughout the whole of Northern Germany. This tendency was confirmed by the influence of Carlstadt, during his residence in East Friesland, in 1528. So strong was the foothold that the Reformed doctrines had gained, that the attempts made, from 1536 to 1540, to introduce the Lutheran confession and cultus, were perseveringly resisted; and resulted in the division of the Church into (high) German Lutheran and (low) German Reformed, which has been perpetuated down to the present day. The Anabap-

* Because they held that the real communion of believers with the human nature of Christ, in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, was not local and outward, that is, by the mouth, but spiritual, that is, by faith, through the operation of the Holy Ghost.

tists also constituted a strong party, especially in Emden ; and carried on a fierce warfare against the Lutheran clergy,* and reproached both the Reformed and Lutherans for their entire want of Church discipline.

Here John de Lasky selected the place of his temporary abode, where the Reformed Church—the Zwinglian doctrines and mode of worship, to which he was warmly attached—had secured a strong, if not a predominant, influence, and were tolerated, at least, by the State. The presence and comparative freedom of various parties of persecuted Protestants led, however, to considerable confusion and disorder ; and the widowed Duchess of Oldenburg, a noble-minded and pious woman, though not free from weaknesses, felt the necessity of introducing some system of comprehensive Church order, adapted to the peculiar condition of the country. For this purpose, she applied, as the Duke himself had done shortly before his death, to De Lasky for counsel. He proposed his friend Hardenberg, who was himself a Frieslander, as general superintendent of ecclesiastical affairs. Hardenberg having declined the office, Lasky was himself urged to accept it. After passing through a severe inward conflict, he yielded, at length, in 1542, upon condition, however, “ that he be obliged to continue in office only in case experience prove that, in calling him to the post, both the Duchess and the Church aimed at promoting the glory of God : should the contrary appear, he would demand of both an honorable dismissal.”† He also stipulated, as he always did in accepting an office, that he be permitted freely to obey any call from his native country. Humble and modest, forgetting his own interests, but unwilling to give up anything demanded by the Word of God, he could say boldly, when the Duchess vacillated, or his own congregation were disposed to resist the authority of Church government : “ As I have freely en-

* Calling out publicly : “ Death to the lying priests, death to the flesh-eaters ! ”

† A call from the Duke Albrecht of Prussia, to Königsburg, Lasky declined, because the Duke would not agree to the Church being entirely independent of the State

gaged in the service of the Church of Christ, my strength and labors are cheerfully placed at the disposal of yourself, duchess, and of this Church. For I am ready not only to devote my property, trifling as it may be, to the good of the Church, without the prospect of any reward or advantage, but also, should it be necessary, to expose my life to any dangers for the honor of Christ, *if you will but confess that you are governed by, and will be subject to, the Word of God.* If you will not do this—if you prefer to obey the maxims of men and the wisdom of this world, I cannot and will not give you my coöperation. The servant of evangelical and apostolical doctrine I am ready to be, in my weakness; nor shall I hesitate to learn anything of which I may be ignorant, from the least of my brethren; but the servant of *human* wisdom in divine things, or of customs which are contrary to the Word of God, I will not be, upon any condition. Human wisdom is in place, and is of value, in human affairs; but, in matters of religion, the will and wisdom of God must take precedence of all the counsels of men."

With such decided views subordinating his life and conduct, not to the arbitrary notions of men, but only to the Word and will of God, Lasky undertook the duties of his office as pastor of the Reformed Church at Emden, and as superintendent of ecclesiastical affairs in East Friesland. Not dependent upon the members of his church, nor upon the favor of the Duchess, he reposed his confidence in the protection of God, and not in the civil government—a power whose interposition he feared more than desired. One of the first important subjects which engaged his attention, was the introduction of a scriptural order of public worship. Luther desired a gradual change in worship; but Lasky, like the Reformers of Switzerland, aimed at once at a thorough and decided reformation, so as to avoid the necessity of a succession of changes. "For such changes," said he, "serve to render religion at first uncertain, and then contemptible, in the judgment of the uncultivated. If, therefore, a change of cultus is to be introduced, I desire it to be

done in such a way, that no additional changes will be necessary in future ; that is, that all the papal abominations, so soon as their sinfulness shall be made evident, be abolished, without exception ; and, in the introduction of new customs, an effort be made to conform as much as possible to the original purity and simplicity of the Apostolic Church, in order thus to supersede the necessity of any subsequent improvement." Like Zwingli, he regarded "everything as forbidden, concerning the adoption of which into Church cultus, God had not given a command;" and, therefore, allowed nothing that "was contrary to the pattern given in the Sacred Scriptures," or that "transcended the limits which it defines." Soon after his installation into office, he accordingly demanded of the Duchess Anna, "for the sake of his conscience and the Word of God," the removal of idolatrous pictures from the churches, and the abolishing of anti-scriptural "adulterous" ceremonies ; and did not rest until he succeeded in carrying out his purpose.

He was opposed to the *kneeling* posture of communicants, because unscriptural and popish. Whilst in Emden, he allowed communicants to receive the sacred symbols *standing* ; but, in England, conforming to the custom of Zurich, he adopted the *sitting* posture, "in order to testify publicly, and in every way, that we abhor idolatry, and intend to oppose it as much as lies in our power." He insisted on the use of ordinary bread in the administration of the Lord's Supper ; and, should a case occur in which wine could not be had, he was willing that something else should be substituted, "if only the main matter, the commemoration of Christ, be preserved, and the sacrament be not undervalued, but celebrated with solemnity and decorum." With equal freedom and independence, however, he took ground against the Swiss, in the matter of private communion ; maintaining, according to the undoubted custom of the apostolic age, the right to bear the elements, whenever desired, into the houses of the sick, and others, provided such private communion "take place

only in cases of necessity, without superstition, and without prejudice to the public administration of the sacrament."

These principles he also maintained when invited by the Archbishop Hermann, in 1543, to assist in the introduction of the Reformation into Cologne. He gave the same advice in London, in 1548, when he was called thither, with Bucer and Martyr of Strasburg, as a counsellor on the Reformation in England. Nor did he recede from his position when, in 1550, he became superintendent of the Reformed Churches, composed of fugitives, in London; though his opposition to the laws of Edward VI., enjoining uniformity of worship, put the security of his Church in jeopardy.

Important as Lasky regarded a thorough reformation in public worship to be, he laid more stress still upon the introduction of a rigid system of Church government. This was rendered the more necessary through the numerous sectaries (Anabaptists) that had taken refuge in Emden. These insisted on strict discipline, and repudiated the Evangelical Church for the want of it. Besides, the government of Spain, to which the Netherlands were subject, had become suspicious of East Friesland, for affording an asylum to so many adherents of the Reformation that had fled from persecution, and threatened to suspend all intercourse, unless the Duchess would take measures to restrain the progress of the sects. Cowardly and mercenary courtiers, from fear of the Emperor, then began to oppose and persecute the sectaries, which forced many of them to enter the established Church. Lasky proved himself to be their true friend. He treated them with extraordinary meekness and wisdom, and did what he could to secure to them the rights of citizenship. Lasky also improved the occasion to perfect the organization of his congregation, and of the Church in general, in East Friesland (1544). He resolved upon introducing a well-ordered system of government and discipline, as the most efficient means to restore order and prosperity to the established Church, which was torn and languishing from the divisions and confusion

caused by the sects. "I declare again," says he, "that we can never get rid of the sects, if we deal rigidly with others, but tolerate vice among ourselves." He determined, therefore, upon a separation of all those from the communion of the State Church who refused to come to the knowledge of the truth, and persisted in despising the authority of God. As, on the one hand, he reproached popery with an attempt to suppress the spiritual office, instituted by Christ, by establishing an arrogant hierarchy, so, on the other, he repudiated the advocates of insubordination in the Church; because, in the abuse of Gospel liberty, they endeavored to set aside what he called the *nerve of all Church government*, namely, the lawful use of Church discipline, which was likewise instituted by Christ, and retained and handed down to us by the apostles.

But the attempt to carry out his purpose met with decided opposition on the part of the Duchess Anna's counselors. Yet Lasky persevered; and, after much conflict, succeeded (1544) in inducing the Duchess, in imitation of the order introduced by Calvin into the Church of Geneva, to institute a *presbytery*, or *consistory*, for the exercise of discipline in the Church, namely, "to associate with the pastor (or pastors) *four citizens* (*ouderlingen* or elders), who, in the judgment of the pastor, are of good repute, and lead a pious life; and who shall be empowered by the congregation, in conjunction with the pastor, to inquire into the conduct of the people, to remind each one of his duty, and, in extreme cases, to excommunicate those, in the name of the whole congregation, who despise all admonition." As a guide to the consistory, or presbytery, in the performance of its duties, Lasky published a book of discipline, in 1545, prepared with the aid of the "constitution" of the Church in Geneva and Cologne, in which he fully unfolded his views on Church order and Church discipline; being firmly resolved that, if his congregation would not endure such discipline, they might indeed drive him away, but that knowingly he would not spare or favor any man.

At the same time, Lasky, patterning after the constitu-

tion of the Church in Strasburg, Geneva, and Cologne, organized the *Cœtus* (or Ministerium), "for the promotion of Christian unity." This was developed, in the course of time, into the *Synods*, as subsequently organized in the Reformed Church. The *Cœtus* consisted of all the ministers of the principality, nearly 200, and met once a week, during the summer, in Emden. Elders were not included. The officers were a president and secretary; the president being chosen for a year. After the assembly had been opened with prayer, inquiry was made into the morals, doctrine, and life of each minister, in rotation, and the condition of his church discussed; as many being called up at each meeting as time would allow. The examination of candidates for the ministry followed, who were required also to preach before the *Cœtus*. Then came discussions, especially on controverted doctrines. Finally, complaints were considered, and disposed of by a vote of the majority. The *Cœtus* was continued, under this form, for the space of forty years, and proved to be a means of great good to the Church. It was suppressed, in 1583, by the Duke Edzard, who was inclined to Lutheranism, "to the sorrow of all the pious, and to the great injury of the Church of God;" but was restored again, after a short interval, and, according to Max Gœbel, still exists in the Reformed Church of East Friesland.

Feeling the necessity of a Confession of Faith adapted to the wants of the Frisian Reformed Church, Lasky drew up a Catechism, about the year 1548, on the basis of the Catechism of Calvin, the latin translation of which had been dedicated to the Church of East Friesland, in 1545. This Catechism, known as the Emden Catechism, was simple, beautiful, and comprehensive. It was subsequently used in all the foreign Reformed Churches; and, in addition to the Catechism of Geneva, rendered important service to Ursinus in the preparation of the Heidelberg Catechism.

Through the teaching and personal influence of Lasky, and through the efficient reformatory measure which he instituted and sustained with remarkable decision and wis-

dom, as superintendent of ecclesiastical affairs during a period of four years, and as pastor of the Reformed Church of Emden for seven years, from 1542 to 1549, the errors of Rome were completely abolished, in the principality, and Church order, peace, and prosperity, were restored. The Reformed Church was not only firmly established, but Emden became also the mother and model of the Reformation in the Netherlands, and especially of the *German Reformed Churches*, bearing a relation to these similar to that which Geneva bore, through Calvin, to the Reformed Church of England and Scotland. Most justly did Emden receive the honorary title: *The asylum of the oppressed and dispersed Church of God*. For, not only did the Reformed Church become strong and prosperous throughout East Friesland, but, being easily accessible from all directions, opening her doors wide, and offering a safe abode to the exiles from England, France, and the Netherlands, who, during this period, were driven from their homes by fiery persecutions; conducting an extensive correspondence with neighboring congregations; and sending out a large number of ministers, to supply spiritual destitutions; she became a centre of light to the whole evangelical Church of Western Europe.

But scarcely had this state of prosperity begun, when it was interrupted, and its destruction was threatened, by the forcible introduction of the Interim, in 1549.* To this Lasky could not think of submitting. He had already resigned the office of superintendent, in 1546, because he saw that he could not carry out his principles of Church gov-

* The *Formula ad Interim*, an edict of the Emperor Charles V., drawn up, at his direction, by Pilgrinus, Bishop of Maumburg, Michael Sidonius, and Agricola, Professor of Theology in Wittenburg, was proclaimed at the Diet of Augsburg, on the 15th of March, 1548—an imperial creed, which allowed the cup in the administration of the Lord's Supper to the Protestant laity, permitted ministers or priests to enter the married state, and conceded several other Protestant views, but retained all the essential doctrines of the Church of Rome; and was designed as a temporary rule or formula of faith and worship, until a general council should terminate all the religious differences of the empire. It was not satisfactory either to Protestants or papists; but was enforced, in many cities and States of Germany, by means of threats or by force of arms, and resulted in much suffering among conscientious Protestants, and in civil commotions, and even threatened a general war.

ernment and discipline in all the churches of the principality. Now he was constrained also to resign the office of pastor of the Reformed Church of Emden, and leave the country; and although the Interim was in force only for three years, till 1552, yet the Reformed mode of worship was suppressed for the time, and the free development and extension of the Church was materially checked.*

The fact has been already alluded to, that, at the invitation of Cranmer,† Lasky visited England, in 1548, as counsellor, (together with Bucer and Martyr, then holding respectively the office of King's Professor of Theology in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge,) touching the formation of the Book of Common Prayer. After remaining a short time, he returned to Emden, where he abode a year longer; but owing to the Lutherans obtaining the upper hand in Friesland, he did not formally resume the duties of his office. When expelled, in 1549, by the introduction of the Interim, and an imperial proclamation, he first repaired to his friend Hardenberg, in Bremen. There he received and accepted a call to become pastor of the newly established foreign Reformed Church of London, composed of German and French fugitives from the Netherlands. Some of these had fled to England, for the free exercise of religion, as early as 1544, and gradually increased by new accessions to their number. In 1548, they began to hold regular divine service in private houses; but, in 1550, the Church of St. Augustine was appropriated to their use, and the foreign organization‡ secured a formal acknowledg-

* On the other hand, however, the Interim was overruled for good. The Reformed Church, as also the foreign Reformed Churches, of East Friesland, independent of the civil power, could unfold the principles of their ecclesiastical polity without restraint. - There is still, up to this day, a prosperous French Reformed Church in Emden, existing under a genuine form of presbyterial government.

† Henry's Life and Times of John Calvin, vol. II. p. 246. The History of the Prayer-Book of the Church of England, 2d ed. Oxford, p. 60.

‡ Like the French *refugies*, at a later period, these fugitives were mostly industrious and wealthy merchants and manufacturers, that is, lace weavers and lace merchants; and were indebted, in a great measure, to their skill and trade in this department of manufactures, for their favorable reception in England. Edward VI. granted the rights of citizenship to 880 members of those foreign Reformed Churches.

ment at the hands of the government. Another foreign Reformed organization, composed of Italians, soon became associated with this one. In 1550, Lasky, the champion of their rights, became the superintendent or head of these foreign churches, and the overseer of their schools.

Here Lasky found a desirable opportunity to establish a Church government, the principles of which were developed from the constitution of the Church in Zurich, Geneva, Emden, and Cologne. The generous king, Edward VI., was pleased to grant these foreign congregations a charter of rights (*Privilegium*, 1550), which exempted them from the operation of the existing law, requiring uniformity of belief and Church order, and guaranteed to them freedom of conscience in doctrine and worship. The Church increasing gradually, numbered at length from three to four thousand souls, and had four pastors, who preached in two or three different languages. Composed of Germans and French, the Church was from the beginning divided into two congregations, each holding its own public worship, using its own language, catechism, liturgy, and hymn-book, and having its own consistory. But the congregations were bound together by a common superintendent, by a common fatherland, common trials and sufferings, and a common faith; also by a common council, composed of the two consistories, which met once a month to discuss matters pertaining to the general interests of the whole Church. Beyond the control of bishops, unaffected by the civil law relating to the Church, and yet protected by government, they held their own constitution, made their own laws, elected their own pastors and Church officers, and thus were free to develop a genuine form of presbyterial polity. But, separated from the world by difference of language and manners and sympathies, and from the reigning Church life by different views in doctrine, worship, and discipline, they became rather austere and exclusive in character; and, having been condemned, persecuted, and driven about, both by the Lutherans and Roman Catholics, the reaction against corruption in doctrine and worship was somewhat

extreme. They not only abolished popish ceremonies, priestly vestments, candles, pictures, and the confessional, but were, it would seem, equally averse to the altar, the organ, the bell, and the kneeling posture in prayer. Notwithstanding these slight blemishes, which are to be regarded as the natural effect of their circumstances and previous history, this organization constituted a more than ordinary exemplification of the true Church of Christ. In addition to the preaching of a pure Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, the careful instruction of youth, and godly living: it combined, also, to a very high degree, the principles of authority and freedom, requiring each member to be subject to the order of the Church, and exercising a most rigid discipline; yet maintaining liberty of conscience for all who were outside of its communion. The charter of Edward, guaranteeing the rights of the foreign Reformed Church in London, did not continue in force for more than four years (1550-53); yet this comprehensive presbyterial polity was so fully matured and confirmed, during this short time, that, when this Church was dispersed along the Maine and the Rhine, and elsewhere, these principles were transplanted and perpetuated, and gave tone afterwards to the whole Reformed Church in the western part of the continent.*

The death of Edward VI., the protector of the foreigners, put an end to their prosperous Church organization. As soon as the bloody Mary ascended the throne, she revoked their charter, and required them to submit to the Church of England, or leave her dominions. With a part of his German congregation, some Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Scotchmen, 175 persons in all, Lasky took ship, in October, 1553, and sailed for Denmark, in the hope of meeting with a friendly reception. The ship was wrecked in a storm. Lasky ran into the harbor of Elsinore. The

* Did space permit, it would be interesting and instructive to give a full account of the principles embodied in the organization of these foreign Reformed congregations, under Lasky, in London. The reader is referred, for more particular information, to the *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphälischen evangelischen Kirche*, von Max Gabel, vol. i. pp. 335-44.

severe treatment which this suffering band of wandering exiles received from the Lutherans in Elsinore, Copenhagen, Rostock, Wismar, Lübeck, and Hamburg, is matter of history.† The king of Denmark, Christian III.‡ treated Lasky respectfully, and extended some favors to his family. At first, he seemed also to lend a favorable ear to Lasky's application on behalf of the fugitives, to make their abode in the country. But Peter Noviomagus, the court-preacher, disappointed their hopes. On Sunday, Nov. 10th, he preached a sermon on the epistle for the day (Phil. 3: 17-21), in which he urged the expulsion of the fugitives from the country. They were fanatics, sacramentarians, and most dangerous heretics; for they denied the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar. Both their doctrines and character, according to Herveg, were painted in the darkest colors. The result was, that, on Monday following, an edict was issued, enjoining upon superintendents, abbots, priors, and preachers, and upon all the knights, squires, and bailiffs, that, if any stranger appear before them, and desire to enter into their service, or establish himself in any city or any part of the country, they first ascertain whence he is, what his profession and what his faith, in order that they take no one into service, and permit no one to locate anywhere, who was an Anabaptist or Sacramentarian (Reformed).

Lasky asked for the privilege to defend his community against the aspersions of Noviomagus; but the request was evaded. He then plead for permission to remain over winter. It could not be given. The exiles received command immediately to re-embark. Even the women, with children at their breasts, were not allowed to wait for calmer weather. Force was quickly employed to drive them into the ship, or beyond the boundary line; and this in

† Church History, by Herveg, vol. i. pp. 89-94. Mosheim's Church History, vol. ii. p. 112, Coote's ed., 1832. Henry's Life of Calvin, vol. ii. p. 277

‡ It was a sense of gratitude, accordingly, as well as a sense of right, that prompted Lasky to address a communication to the king, in which he set forth, in detail, and with manly decision, the great injustice which he had done to him and his fugitive Church.

spite of all their prayers to be allowed to remain to the end of winter.|| In Germany, they were also treated as enemies of the country and of the Church. Westphal called the members of Lasky's exiled community, *the devil's martyrs*. Bugenhagen refused to acknowledge them as Christians, and they were told that papists could be better endured than they. The hatred of the Lutherans pursued the wanderers to Lübeck and Rostock. Many preachers branded the exiles with the name of heretics, and thus excited the populace against them. They were also decried as Anabaptists by the clergy, and the magistrates were, therefore, compelled to deny them a place of shelter.

Driven from city to city, and tossed upon the sea, Lasky did not find a place of shelter for these suffering, homeless Christians, till 1554, when, after much difficulty, he secured a temporary abode for them in East Friesland, Frankfort, Strasburg, Wesel, and some other cities. Lasky himself, with the members of his foreign German Church, were cordially received by his old friends at Emden. His children were allowed to remain in Hamburg till spring. The duchess, however, and her court, treated Lasky coolly. His strict views of Church order and Christian life, which had become more decided during his residence in England, and the imprudent zeal of some of the foreigners against organs and altars, gave offence. Under the pretext that his continuance in Friesland was offensive to the Spanish court, and, therefore, dangerous to the country, he was banished the following year. About this time, too, he lost his property, through the dishonesty of a relative—a misfortune that he bore with the greatest resignation.

He left, and came to Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in April, 1555. But he bore along with him into exile the warmest affections of his Emden congregation and his ministerial brethren of Friesland. They looked upon him as their

|| Henry's Life of Calvin, vol. ii. pp. 267-78. The condition of Lasky greatly affected Calvin. Addressing him, he says: "The cruel conduct of Denmark affects me bitterly. Great God! what an instance of barbarity among a Christian people! It surpassed even the fury of the waves." He praised Lasky's moderation and firmness.

head, and supported him by their contributions, which he cheerfully accepted. At Frankfort Lasky was kindly received. Hither the *French* Reformed congregation had fled from London, in 1554. The magistrate, then favorably disposed towards them, extended the hospitality of the city. They obtained possession of a church, which was used by them in connection with a congregation of English Non-conformists, that had escaped secretly. Lasky now obtained permission also, on behalf of his *German* congregation, to make their abode in Frankfort. Another church was appropriated to the use of the Puritans; and the French and German congregations again worshipped together in the same building.*

In the midst of the evangelical Lutheran Church, Lasky now renewed his former efforts to restore peace between the Lutherans and Reformed; and prosecuted his efforts with fresh zeal, because he regarded the continuation of the controversy as unjustifiable, unchristian, and very injurious. And he had good reason to hope for success. He was really concerned to do both parties justice. His views of the Lord's Supper were those of Calvin, and he was willing to subscribe the (altered) Augsburg Confession. Besides, he stood high in the estimation of those upon whom the final result mainly depended—of Melancthon, Calvin, and Bullinger, of Otto Henry, Elector of the Palatinate, and of Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse. Forgiving all the wrongs he had suffered at the hands of the Lutherans, he labored and argued for peace, extended the hand of Christian brotherhood, and begged them to accept it; but it was refused. Through the opposition and influence of Brentius, mainly, all his hopes were frustrated.

At length, after an absence of nineteen years, the way was open for Lasky's return to Poland. At the diet held in 1556, the important law was passed, that it should be lawful for any nobleman to introduce the observance of the evangelical service into his house; and Rome was called

* This is the origin of the flourishing French and German Reformed Church of Frankfort, that has been perpetuated to the present time.

upon to correct the abuses with which it was charged. After publishing a revised edition of his book of Church order and discipline, in Frankfort, which he dedicated to the king, the senate, and the diet of Poland, he proceeded to Wittenberg, to confer with Melancthon: the latter gave him a letter to the King of Poland, exhorting him to promote the Reformation in that country. On his return (1556), the enterprising Lasky, though fifty-eight years of age, was wholly devoted to accomplishing the work of reform in his native land. He wrote on the subject, demonstrating the necessity of abolishing the Roman hierarchy (Dec. 1556). But nothing was left undone to make him an object of suspicion to the king: it was even reported that he was a determined enemy to Poland, and that he was engaged in collecting troops to effect a revolution. These reports made some impression on the monarch, till, meeting with one of Lasky's relatives, who opened his eyes to the truth, he observed: * "You know that such movements and disturbances frequently lead to the ruin of States. Say, therefore, to Lasky: Carry on the work of religion among yourselves, and in a short time you will see that I look more to the help of God than to that of men."

But, at the next diet, the affair was again deferred. Still, though standing alone, Lasky did not relax his efforts, but went boldly forward. Various successes and various reverses followed. We cannot go into particulars. Yet there was general progress in the work of reform. A synod was assembled by the Catholics at Lowicz, in which the abuses of the Church were spoken of with great boldness. But it was not till 1559 that an attempt was made to exclude the bishops from the senate. This proved fruitless. The decrees of the Council of Trent, however, were utterly rejected by the diet. Thus, the struggle between the two parties continued for years, without any decisive event. Lasky died in 1560, and saw no definite result from his faithful labors. But, by the energetic and persevering efforts

* Henry's Life of Calvin, pp. 347-49.

which he had put forth, he laid the foundation for the settlement subsequently agreed upon at Sandomir, (1570).

John de Lasky, the Polish nobleman and bold reformer, was a strong man and a devout Christian. His conversion was not, like that of Calvin and Luther, a sudden change wrought by an overwhelming power, but like that of Zwingli, a gradual passing over from darkness into light, by means of Christian instruction. Hence, his religious life was not a vehement impulse, bearing him along against all opposition, but rather a quiet power, deliberate and clear, but firm and unshaken. The character of Lasky may be said to be the peculiar blending of seemingly contradictory elements. In philosophy a disciple of Erasmus, and of one mind with Luther as to the inner life of religion, he was in theology and worship a Zwinglian, and in Church government and discipline a Calvinist. Decided in his theological opinions, firm in his opposition to error, and rigid in his views of moral conduct, he was nevertheless not censorious, but treated those who differed from him with great mildness and forbearance, especially for the age in which he lived; he accorded conscientious convictions even to his violent opponents, and, cherishing an humble opinion of his own spiritual progress, he urged the necessity of making allowances for the moral deficiencies in the character of others. We may mention, particularly, the meekness with which he bore the virulent persecution of Westphal, who called him and his fugitive Church, *the devil's martyrs*, and the forbearance with which he treated the enemies of Church order, in Emden (1542-49), the leaders, namely, of the resident Anabaptists, Menno Simon and David Joris. Such a spirit led him to study the things that make for peace. He regarded it as one of his first duties to promote harmony and love among his brethren. Like Melancthon and Calvin, he was, accordingly, most earnestly devoted to the cause of uniting the two branches of the Reformation. Nor was he shaken in his purpose or zeal by the harsh treatment or repeated persecutions of his opponents. Hence, in the presence of theologians, princes,

and kings, he vindicated the right of the Reformed to be tolerated and acknowledged, and especially of his church of foreigners.

In one particular only was he rigid and unyielding. The careful study of the Scriptures, and his own experience, had led him to the firm conviction, that organization and discipline were essential to a true Church of Christ. Disorder and irregular living in the Church he could not endure. Tolerant and yielding as to questions of doctrine and worship, he demanded most decidedly an organization of the Church that was in all respects conformable to the principles and spirit of the New Testament. To introduce such a scriptural organization into his Church, and maintain it, he regarded, accordingly, as the great mission of his life. In this respect, he held a middle place between the separatistic Anabaptists, on the one hand, and the Lutherans, on the other, who were without any organization. Thus, he rendered possible, on German soil, the founding of the Reformed Church, which combines the truth of both tendencies. He not only rendered it possible, but actually accomplished it. It constitutes the chief merit and honor of Lasky, that he fixed his eye steadily on the development and true organization of the whole Church, which is the body of Christ. Nor could any suspicions, or opposition, or animosity, ever cause him to swerve from his purpose. Of this his whole life is the proof.

Renouncing the brightest worldly prospects, as one of the most wealthy and prominent Polish noblemen; declining the offer of the richest and most influential bishoprics in his native land; casting in his lot for many years with the suffering followers of Jesus Christ, who were driven from shore to shore; sympathizing with and befriending the persecuted for conscience' sake, even though they had been his opponents and defamers; rigid towards himself, but forbearing and yielding towards others, because truly unassuming and humble; never seeking his own temporal interests, but sacrificing his time and energies, his wealth and all, to the scriptural organization and growth of the

Church, amid a series of persecutions the most virulent, and of trials the most severe; banished time and again for preaching Christ and insisting on Church order, and stripped of his property, yet resigned to his afflictions; forgiving towards his enemies, and unshaken in his devotion to the Word of God and the cause of Christ:—the key-note of such moral heroism, and so self-denying and honorable a life is given in his own language, uttered in 1555: "Licht ist allein in Christus, welcher den ganzen Menschen erleuchtet, und desshalb ist alles Finsterniss, was ausser Christus und seinem Worte gelernt, gelehrt und gehalten wird."

Lancaster, Pa.

E. V. G.

ART. VIII.—THE LIFE AND LABORS OF MICHAEL SCHLATTER.

THE LIFE AND LABORS OF REV. MICHAEL SCHLATTER; with a full account of his Travels and Labors among the Germans in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Virginia; including his services as Chaplain in the French and Indian War, and in the War of the Revolution. 1716 to 1790. By Rev. H. Harbaugh, A. M., Member of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; Author of "The Sainted Dead," "Heavenly Recognition," "Birds of the Bible," "Union with the Church," etc. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1857. pp. 375.

THE name of Michael Schlatter has always held a high place in the history of the German Reformed Church of America; especially among those who have made this history the subject of careful study. Though not the first ordained minister who was constrained to follow the oppressed Reformed emigrating from the Palatinate to the new world, he must, nevertheless, be regarded as the pioneer of this branch of the Church of Christ on American soil. He was the foremost man, the most laborious, influential and effi-

cient man, without any doubt, among those who laid her foundations one hundred years ago ; and this, without any disparagement of his self-denying, godly coadjutors in the field. Besides, his whole life is a striking illustration of the divine power of the religion of Christ : a bright example both of an humble Christian and of a devoted minister of the Gospel, which no one can look on, and study seriously, without much spiritual benefit.

Yet of such a man, sustaining so direct and intimate a relation to an original branch of the Protestant Church transplanted to a country which has risen to be one of the first nations of the earth, no complete memoir was ever written. Nearly sixty-seven years have elapsed since he was laid in his grave in Franklin Square,* Philadelphia. The main facts of his life have been rapidly falling into oblivion. Tradition has been losing her precious trust. To many intelligent laymen, but little more than his name has been known. Many ministers have not been much better informed. Nor was this strange. There have been but very meagre resources at hand. Now and then a few isolated facts were published, or some extracts from his Journal. Even his Journal has not been accessible. Neither in English nor in German, has it been extant. A copy might have been found in the library of the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, or here and there in the private library of a minister, who preserved it carefully as a precious treasure ; but no where else. And as but few had any adequate conception of the very prominent and efficient part which Schlatter acted in organizing and establishing the German Reformed Church in America, there have been but few, comparatively, who could properly estimate the loss which the Church has been suffering through its ignorance on the subject.

The work which has just left the press on *The Life and Labors of Michael Schlatter*, by the Rev. Mr. Harbaugh, is to be regarded, therefore, as a response to a deep want that

*The old cemetery of the German Reformed Church, of Race Street, Philadelphia.

has been felt with increasing force for the last quarter of a century—felt more generally than expressed. Nothing but a lively sense of this want could have induced the author to undertake the delicate and difficult task at this late day, when some of the best sources of information no longer exist, and those which do exist are not easy of access. He merits our heartfelt thanks for what he has done—for producing a work which, in its conception and style, its particularity, fulness and thoroughness, meets the just demands of the Church. This is saying a great deal in commendation of the book. But a careful examination will, we believe, sustain the judgment.

Michael Schlatter was born of pious parents, in St. Gall, Switzerland, July 14th, 1716; and brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. After passing through the Gymnasium, he was placed under the instruction of Professor Waegelin, of his native town; and at the early age of *fourteen* was examined and accepted as a candidate for the ministry. Possessing a somewhat restless disposition, he occupied different posts as a teacher and a minister in Switzerland and Holland, until 1746, when, moved by the touching appeals from the destitute German Reformed Churches of Pennsylvania, he came to America as a missionary, at the age of thirty years, under appointment from the Synod of North and South Holland. For four years and a half (Aug., 1746—Feb., 1751) he labored incessantly, and with extraordinary energy and self-denial, as pastor of the churches at Philadelphia and Germantown, and as an exploring missionary, visiting and preaching to the destitute Germans in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Virginia, organizing churches and pastoral charges and forming plans to provide them with the stated means of grace. Upon the unanimous decision and at the urgent solicitation of the Cœtus of the German Reformed Church, the organization of which he had effected in 1747 (Sept. 29th), he undertook a mission to Europe, in order to represent clearly and fully the condition of the churches, to procure a supply of Bibles, obtain ministers and school-

teachers, and secure an annual support, for the time being, for schools and churches. This mission was very successful. By personal interviews with Synods, and with ministers and laymen in Holland, the Palatinate and Switzerland, and especially by the publication of his Journal, he produced a deep impression both on the Continent and in Great Britain. The result was a stream of support and influence which continued to flow for at least forty years.

After an absence of about eighteen months, Schlatter returned in safety, July 28th, 1852, and resumed his labors as pastor and missionary, though his tours do not appear to have been either as numerous or as extensive as before. The Church being better supplied with a stated ministry, the same necessity no longer existed. The Church difficulties in Philadelphia, growing out of the irregular course pursued by Steiner and Rubel, induced him to resign his charge in 1755; when he became Superintendent for one or two years of the Charity Schools established and sustained among the Germans in Pennsylvania by an Association organized in England. The prominence which his great activity and self-denying zeal had unavoidably given him, made him a conspicuous object for the enemy. The arrows began to fly. Too upright to use cunning, too modest to push himself forward, and too meek to return blow for blow, he became the object of suspicion both to the Germans and to the Coetus; and rather than be the occasion of ill feeling and disturbance or division, he preferred sacrificing himself, and began to stand aloof. In March, 1757, he accepted a Commission from the Earl of Loudon, constituting him Chaplain to His Majesty's Royal American Regiment of Foot; and accompanied an expedition to Nova Scotia against the French. Returning in the fall of 1759, he retired to *Sweetland*, the name of his residence on Chesnut Hill, about ten miles from Philadelphia. Here he lived in quiet until 1777, when we find him engaged in the active duties of Chaplain in the Revolutionary war. But his judgment and heart were with the colonies.* Still

* "We find him again in the active duties of chaplain at the beginning of

under commission from the old government and refusing to obey orders, he was cast into prison. His house was plundered. He was soon released, however; and then returned to his family on Chesnut Hill. Here he passed the remainder of his life in peace and quiet, without taking any part, as it seems, in the public affairs of the Church.

Schlatter died in October, 1790, in the seventy-fifth year of his age.

The prominent traits in the character of Michael Schlatter were uncommon energy, diligence and perseverance, and great power of organization, combined with a remarkable degree of humility, modesty and meekness.

To illustrate his energy, and power of endurance, we cite a few facts. He took ship at Amsterdam, on his first voyage to America, on the 1st of June, 1746; and sailed for Boston, where he arrived on the 1st of August, having been *two months* on sea. Here, after so long and tedious a voyage, not in a modern steamer, but in an ordinary sailing vessel, he rested but *two days*; received, as he says, "in this land of my pilgrimage with much love and kindness by the Hon. J. Wendel, a distinguished Holland merchant, and an officer of the government there." On the 4th he set out on his journey by land and came to Newport, Rhode Island, on the 7th. In *four days* more he travelled two hundred and thirty miles to New York, where he arrived on the 11th. Here he passed the remainder of the month. He did not reach Philadelphia until Sept. 6th. But the very next day, the 7th, he went a distance of sixteen miles to Whitpain, to visit the oldest German minister in those regions, the Rev. J. B. Boehm. The day following, on

the Revolutionary War; whether by virtue of the old appointment or by a new commission, does not appear. Having been all along interwoven officially, and by various circumstances, prominently in the affairs of the government, he was at the beginning of the war under the appointment of the old authorities, and acted as chaplain in the British army. This was, however, only for a short time. He soon found himself impelled by his feelings and sense of right, to espouse the side and cause of the colonies, which he did in the face of danger and great self-sacrifice. Accordingly in the month of September, 1777, when the British invaded Germantown, he refused to obey orders, and thus subjected himself to the punishment which military law inflicts for such an act." pp. 336, 337.

the 8th, he went a distance of eight miles, to see Mr. J. Reif, to require of him, agreeably to the instructions of the Synod of Holland, an account of the moneys collected in Holland by him and Rev. G. M. Weiss, sixteen years previously, for the benefit of the churches of Pennsylvania. "That no time might be lost," he says, "I returned to Philadelphia on the 9th, a distance of twenty-three miles, to make enquiry in relation to the one hundred and thirty German Bibles, which, some years before, had been sent thither by the affectionate care of the Christian Synod of Holland." On the 11th, he administered the Lord's Supper in Philadelphia to one hundred communicants, preceded by a preparatory and succeeded by a thanksgiving sermon. On the 16th, we find him going to Bucks county, "to greet Rev. P. H. Dorstius," and to explain the nature of his mission to America. On the 18th he preaches in the forenoon in Philadelphia, and after the services gives "the whole congregation an exposition of the Synodical instructions which I had brought from the Fatherland." The same afternoon he goes to Germantown, preaches, and gives the people a similar "exposition." The two congregations were then united in one charge. This was the *first* charge regularly organized. The day following, the 19th, he went to Old Goshenhoppen, a distance of thirty-five miles, and preached on the 20th.

In the short space of *thirteen* days, accordingly, after his arrival in Philadelphia, he preaches on two Sundays in Philadelphia; administers the Lord's Supper; preaches on a Sunday in Germantown; organizes the first charge composed of these two churches; makes four visits in different directions to the country at distances of from twenty-three to thirty-five miles, and returns from all, but one, to Philadelphia; takes preliminary steps to make settlement with Mr. Reif; and lays his plans for future operations. To estimate these labors aright we must not forget the travelling on horse-back, the bad roads, the slow communication by mail, and the like, as they were one hundred and eleven years ago—all in broadest contrast with the extraordinary facilities of communication of the present day.

As a further illustration of Schlatter's energy and power of endurance, take the following extract, selected almost at random, from his Journal. "On the 10th (of October, 1748) I travelled forty miles, to Amwell, (New Jersey), preached there in the afternoon, and, on the morning of the 11th, I went nineteen miles farther, to Rockaway, and in the afternoon to Foxhill, to hold a preparatory service, in which last place, I administered the Holy Supper on the 12th, and, after the thanksgiving sermon, returned to Rockaway, ten miles from thence. Here, on the 13th, I administered the Lord's Supper, and, after the thanksgiving sermon, on the same day, I returned to Amwell, a distance of nineteen miles. After I had administered the Lord's Supper in this congregation, and preached the thanksgiving sermon on the 14th, I went, the same afternoon, from thence, and, after having travelled forty miles, I arrived late in the evening in Philadelphia." p. 185. That is, he preached *eight* sermons, administered the Lord's Supper *three* times, and travelled besides, a distance of one hundred and thirty-six miles on horse-back, all in *five* days.

He usually travelled from Lancaster to Philadelphia in one day, a distance of sixty-three miles, as he called it. It was rather more than less. To meet his appointments, he travelled both by night and by day. On the 7th of May, 1748, for example, he travelled forty miles. The next day, the 8th, he preached a preparatory sermon in Fredericktown, Maryland, in the school-house; "and on the same day, in company with an elder of this congregation, who, of his own free will, offered to accompany me through Virginia. I continued my journey thirty-four miles farther to Conococheague, crossing the so-called Blue Mountains,* so that we did not arrive in Conococheague till two o'clock in the morning of the 9th, when we came to the house of an honest Swiss, and gratefully enjoyed a pleasant rest. I preached there yet on the same day." p. 171. Illustrations might easily be multiplied. But these must suffice. They

* Now called South Mountain.

are fair specimens of a course of incessant toil and extraordinary activity, which, as a pastor and a missionary, he pursued for more than four years. Nor does he ever seem to lament, as though his lot were a hard one. On the contrary, his Journal glows with gratitude to God for the numberless blessings bestowed upon him, and for the privilege of gathering the scattered sheep into the fold of Jesus Christ.

This spirit of self-denial manifested itself also under another form. Schlatter performed this extraordinary amount of labor, attended with great exposure and peril, without receiving any pecuniary reward from the people, for more than a year after his arrival in America. He became pastor of Philadelphia and Germantown in September, 1746. "From that time on," he says, "I have preached in these united churches on every Lord's day, when I was not absent on journeys. And in order that by deed, I might convince them that I did not serve them merely for the sake of my bread, I neither required nor received any salary for the first year." p. 131.

At a later period, November, 1747, we find a still more striking exhibition of the same spirit: "I cannot refrain from referring briefly to the fact that these three* congregations, from gratitude for the service I had rendered them, handed me a pecuniary reward; and this was the first money which, since my arrival in America up to this time, I have received from any congregation for my labor and pains. Also, in my own congregations, up to the present time, I have drawn no salary. I must state, however, that different congregations have offered me some money, but I declined receiving it, in order to convince them that I did not seek theirs, but them; whilst, in the mean time, God has provided for me in a way that calls for devout praise, and has also enabled me to be content with little." p. 169. Here is the spirit of an Apostle.

But Schlatter was humble and modest, as well as ener-

* Amwell, Rockaway and Foxhill, in New Jersey, now incorporated into the Presbyterian Church.

getic, laborious and self-denying. His modesty is the pleasing under-tone of his Journal. Nowhere does he manifest the least self-complacency in view of the extraordinary amount of labor which he had performed. Nor does he ever bring *himself* into the foreground in showing what and how much he has done. It is rather the desire to furnish a faithful representation of the condition of the destitute German Reformed Churches, based upon his own observation and experience, that unavoidably gives himself and his labors a conspicuous place in his Journal. To be convinced of this, it is only necessary to read his earnest and touching appeal to the Synod of Holland on behalf of his famishing brethren in America. We have but little room for extracts. Moreover, the truth of our remark becomes apparent rather from the study of his whole life than from single passages taken from his Journal. Yet we cannot refrain from giving one quotation more.

He is pleading on behalf of his few ministerial brethren in America. They needed both deep sympathy and pecuniary support, for they were compelled to waste their precious time in digging and ploughing the fields, which they desired to spend in the vineyard of the Lord. The burden of their labors, being but a few among so many helpless congregations, pressed very heavily upon them. Then to enforce this plea for his suffering fellow-servants, he speaks of himself by way of example: "I reject with disgust all ill-odored self-praise; and I can not glory save in my infirmities; but if it may serve to the awakening of others who may be able to come to our aid, I will, in all lowliness, and to the praise of that God who supported me, and gave me the will and the power to labor, say that from the year 1747 till the beginning of the year 1751, I have travelled in this part of America, in the service of the lost sheep, to collect them together, to bring them in order, and edify them, a distance of more than *eight thousand* English miles—not reckoning my passage across the ocean—and this for the most part on my own horse, by day and by night, without respect to heat or cold, which is often alike severe in

this country; yea, without avoiding danger, as not counting my life dear unto myself. * * * Amid all this travelling about I have preached *six hundred and thirty-five* times; and through all these labors God has spared my health and strength, and has not suffered my desire and zeal to serve the Churches to be extinguished, but rather to be increased." Afterwards he adds: "Excuse me, Reverend Fathers and Brethren! that I have spoken so much of myself and my doings. It has not been done, believe me, in order that I might boast; but by such a public representation of the labors of your own brethren, still more to influence your brotherly hearts in fraternal love. and sympathetic mercy, and to awaken you, Reverend Fathers, in the most friendly manner, according to your ability, to come to the assistance of your fellow-laborers, and to cause that such as can help them, shoulder to shoulder, to bear the great weight under which they must otherwise sink, may soon be sent to them." pp. 215, 217.

In harmony with this spirit, are all his manifestations of character under all circumstances. When persecuted and injured, he was meek and forbearing. He did not render evil for evil. The Steiner difficulty in Philadelphia furnishes an instructive illustration of Schlatter's decision, tempered by love and gentleness. He was also a peace-maker. He hated, and lamented over, strife and discord. To allay strife where it existed, and to promote harmony and peace in the Church, seems to have been one of the fixed objects of his life, to which he was willing to devote much of his time and endure great self-denial.

These traits of character must be referred to some principle—to a law of life working from within. From his Journal, and from his biography, taken as a whole, we gather that this law of his life, as a minister of the Gospel, was to sacrifice himself, and all his personal interests, to the honor of Jesus Christ, and to the prosperity and peace of His Church.

It is here we find, not a justification, but the secret of his comparative inactivity for a period of thirty years, in

the latter part of his life. The author handles this subject with a tender heart and a discriminating judgment. Very aptly does he say: "Though we may regret his retirement, yet ought we to know more than we do of the circumstances, to censure with decision and severity." Yet after a careful study of the subject, in its various connections, we do not feel prepared to endorse the opinion that his isolation is "a great blemish on his ministerial honor, and a gloomy shadow hanging over this part of his earnest and useful life." Through a variety of circumstances, and especially through the influence of Mr. C. Saur's German paper,* published at Germantown, a tide of feeling had arisen against him. The intent of his activity was misconstrued and misunderstood. He had been the most prominent man in the Church. He had been more generally respected and beloved than any other. Now long continued misrepresentation, and slander, at length started a reaction; and by a natural law the reaction of feeling against him among the people, was stronger and more general than it could have been against any other man. This feeling was shared by a majority of Cœtus, perhaps by a large majority; and expression was given to their want of confidence in a letter to the Synod of Holland. The good man's heart was pained. The avenues to the confidence of the congregations were closed. His sense of propriety did not permit him to attend the meetings of Cœtus, where his presence and coöperation were no longer welcome. He would not contend against his enemies, for he was eminently a man of peace. Nor could he turn his back upon the Reformed Church, in which he had been born, and for which he had lived, and enter another communion. There seemed, therefore, to be no alternative for him but to veer into retirement, and seek to serve His Master and the Church within the quiet circle of an eddy of life, protected against the force of the current, and sheltered from the storm, by the Rock that was higher than he. Adopting this interpretation, we may see in the comparative inactiv-

* See "Life and Labors of Schlatter," page 292 et. seq.

ity of the latter part of Schlatter's life, a meek and cheerful resignation to the dark and mysterious course of Divine Providence.

From this brief review of the life and character of Michael Schlatter, we pass to an examination of the book itself that has been put into the hands of the Church by the Rev. Mr. Harbaugh.

We have said already that the work is thorough and particular. The materials are drawn mostly from original sources—from Church records, from ancient documents, from trustworthy contemporaneous works, and from the testimony of living witnesses. The numerous references in the notes to manuscripts, periodicals and books, indicate an extensive research, and a patient study of the times in which Mr. Schlatter lived—a patient study of previous and collateral history, as well as of the facts of his own life. Obtaining thus a correct point of observation from which the author could judge of the connection and bearing of facts and circumstances, he has reproduced the age and the man. He has wrought out a consistent and well-connected whole. He has not given us vague generalities mingled with moral reflections drawn from his own mind; but clear, general outlines which become complete in particulars derived from a view of Schlatter as he was. The book possesses, what we may be permitted to call, *objective*, instead of subjective, particularity. We feel that it is *Schlatter* himself who rises up before us, rather than *Harbaugh* representing Schlatter. On this account, the book as a whole, is very satisfactory. The nature and design of Schlatter's mission to America—the fostering care of the Church of Holland—Schlatter's relation to the Charity Schools—the causes of the unfortunate misunderstanding between himself and the Cetus—the probable reasons for his retirement from participation in the general affairs of the Church during the last thirty years of his life—and the peculiar spirit and character of the man;—are all set forth in a light that enables one to form an intelligent and well-grounded judgment on these interesting questions. It has, indeed, some blemishes; but

these are fewer than might reasonably have been anticipated in view of the difficulties with which the author had to contend. The book is very interesting also. The eye is attracted, and runs from point to point as being absorbed in the study of a life-like picture.

Possessing this objective character, the book naturally reproduces, not only Schlatter himself, but also the relations of Schlatter, truthfully—his relation to the Synod of Holland, to the Lutheran Church, to the first Dr. Muhlenberg, to the Cætus, to England and to America. The general tone of the memoir corresponds to the general spirit of Schlatter. Schlatter was a man of broad views and broad affections. He was Reformed. And he loved the Reformed Church with a strong and steady love. But he was a man—a German—a Christian also; and he felt as such. He loved the interests of the Germans who were not Reformed. And he respected and loved the interests of the Lutheran Church. One of the warmest and most lasting friendships which Schlatter formed in America, was with Dr. Muhlenberg, who has justly been called the father of the American Lutheran Church.

In this respect, the book is faithful to its precious trust. It possesses a truly catholic spirit. It is not intent on glorifying the German Reformed Church. Hence it is not betrayed into an ignoring of the Lutheran Church. These two branches of the Church of the Reformation, though differing widely on some important points of Christian doctrine, as also in their prominent peculiarities of practical life, have, nevertheless, always been so closely related, by language, by a common nationality, by intermarriage, and so on, that it is not possible to write a truthful history of the one, or the biography of any leading man belonging to the one, without frequent allusions and references to the history of the other. A history or biography, which omits all such allusions and references is of necessity sadly deficient. It fails to correspond to general facts as they are, or to the life of a man as it really is. But if these references are introduced, much depends upon the spirit in which

it is done. A narrow, green-eyed spirit is constantly in danger of clipping and twisting facts, and of disparaging the position, and motives, and merits, of those who do not bear its own name; whilst the genuine spirit of Christian charity, which envieth not, is not puffed up, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, and thinketh no evil, recognizes the existence of others, accords to them their true relative position, and can speak of their merits with freedom and pleasure. It is this spirit that breathes through *The Life and Labors of Schlatter*. There is no depreciation of the Lutheran Church as compared with the Reformed, or of the labors of Lutheran as compared with those of Reformed ministers. We discover no reluctance on the part of the author to make honorable mention of the Lutheran Church wherever the progress of the subject requires him to do so.

True, the work gives us but little information on the early history of the Lutheran Church. To do it, was not the author's object, nor did it fall in as a part of his plan. It was his design to draw a portrait of Schlatter, and throw light upon the early history of the German Reformed Church. Nothing more. But as both Schlatter and the Reformed Church were associated with the Lutheran Church, the carrying out of the author's design consistently, rendered it necessary to make statements and allusions pertaining to the Lutheran Church. The catholic spirit of Christian charity requires that these statements be made, not omitted; and that they be made, not only according to the demands of truth, but from due respect and love for the Lutheran Church. Now, it is just this catholic spirit that arrests one's attention in reading Harbaugh's *Life of Schlatter*. There is not a sentence in the book that can offend the self-respect of a Lutheran, or grate harshly upon his feelings.* We rejoice at seeing such a work from the pen

* In confirmation of these views, we quote from the "Missionary," of June 25th, 1857, edited by the Rev. W. A. Passavant, Pittsburg: "With untiring industry and vast labor he (Mr. Harbaugh) has collected the scattered incidents in the life and labors of Michael Schlatter, the Patriarch of the German Reformed Church in America, and from them has erected a monument

of a minister of the German Reformed Church—breathing the earnest, irenical spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism.

There is one chapter in the book, which, under one view of the case, could have been omitted. The want of it would not have been felt by the most of readers. But under another view, it could not have been omitted without serious loss. The insertion of it indicates the animus of the work—the desire of the author not only to exhibit fully the inner life of Schlatter, but also to bring out the amiable and winning traits of character in those whom Schlatter loved. We refer to the thirteenth chapter, entitled *Schlatter and Muhlenberg*. Here we see the large-heartedness and the warm-heartedness of these great and good men. It is refreshing to read how these fathers of the two German branches of the Protestant Church in America, exchanged visits and communed with each other; how Schlatter wrote to Holland in praise of Muhlenberg and Muhlenberg wrote to Halle in praise of Schlatter; how Schlatter fell on the neck of Muhlenberg on his return from Europe in 1752, and Muhlenberg warmly reciprocated such sincere friendship and love; and how they loved and took counsel of each other until death. “Who does not sincerely desire,” may we not ask, in the language of the author, “that the spirit of these men may ever reign as the

to the memory of this great and good man, which will stand while true worth and abundant labors are had in grateful remembrance by the Church. Not only the members of the Reformed, but also of the Lutheran Church, owe Mr. Harbaugh a debt of gratitude for this valuable memoir, and we take pleasure thus publicly in expressing our indebtedness to the respected author for this important contribution to the history of the German Churches of this country.”

The “Lutheran Observer,” of June 26th, expresses a similar judgment: “The book before us is a seasonable, well-written and handsomely gotten up volume. Mr. Harbaugh had a noble subject and has done it ample justice. He has indulged neither in inflated eulogy, nor in sounding glorification of the German Reformed Church; and if he has not made a hero of the subject of the memoir, he has produced one of the most readable, interesting and instructive books of the kind that we have looked into for some time. The authorities referred to, also furnish the best evidence that the book is a faithful history. The collection of the facts and their verification must have cost him a vast amount of research and patient labor, for which he is entitled to many thanks and the book to liberal patronage. We take pleasure in recommending it, and have no doubt it will find, as it deserves, a ready sale in sister Churches, as well as among our German Reformed brethren.”

spirit of these two confessions in this country? As they are, in an important sense, the fathers of these two branches of the Church in America, let all the children show themselves worthy of such parentage by cultivating the same spirit."

The work does equal justice to the Synods of Holland. The first German Reformed minister, Rev. George Michael Weisz, was sent to America by the upper Consistory or Classis of the Palatinate, in 1727; and was assisted on his way by the Classis of Amsterdam. Through him the wants of the German Reformed Churches in Pennsylvania were first presented to the Church of Holland in such a way as to call forth its formal action. From this time on, the Synods of Holland, conducting its operations through the Classis of Amsterdam, acted the part of a nursing mother towards their German brethren in America. They issued appeals for German Reformed ministers from the Palatinate and Switzerland, in behalf of the churches in Pennsylvania. In response to these appeals Schlatter placed himself at their disposal. The Synods sent him to America with a variety of judicious instructions, among others, to organize churches and charges, and especially to organize a German Reformed Cœtus or Synod. They also collected large sums of money,* which were applied to the support of ministers and school-masters, and ministers, widows; to the payment of the travelling expenses of ministers to the meetings of Cœtus, and sometimes of the elders; and to the purchase of Bibles,† in large numbers for gratuitous distribution among the people. Through this fostering care, which was continued for more than a half century, the German Reformed Church was planted in America, and nourished, until it became a self-sustaining Church.

These facts are all clearly and fully developed in the

* The collections made in the Palatinate and Switzerland were disbursed through the Synods of Holland.

† Some of these old German folio Bibles have been preserved, and are still in use on the pulpits of some German Reformed churches. The writer preached from one of them a short time ago.

Life of Schlatter. The precise relation of the Church of Holland to the organization and early history of the German Reformed Church in America, is more satisfactorily brought out than in any work that has yet been published in the English language. And it is brought out in a way that reflects the highest honor on the Synods of Holland. "There has, perhaps, not been since the Reformation, a historical fact that rises to such true Christian sublimity as the unwearied and disinterested devotion of the Churches of Holland, the Palatinate, and Switzerland, to the infant and struggling Churches of the distant new world. Everlasting gratitude be given first to God; and then to them, for their works of life and love; and everlasting honor to that blessed religion of Jesus Christ, which can inspire human hearts to become so much like Himself and His holy angels, as in such a spirit to offer themselves and theirs in the service of others without seeking their own advantage and honor." p. 85. As we behold the German Reformed Church now firmly established, and enjoying the rich blessings of a true faith and a scriptural organization; and remember at what an immense cost of labor and strength, of time and money, her broad foundations were laid, our hearts swell with grateful emotions; and we bless the memory of those wise and noble servants of Jesus Christ in Germany, and especially in Holland, who united, and persevered against every obstacle and discouragement, in so exalted a work of Christian beneficence.

In this connection we find it difficult to repress an expression of the regret we share with many others, both in the Dutch and in the German Reformed Church, that the fraternal relations between these two Churches, reared by the love of a common foster mother, and living side by side in the new world, have been interrupted; and interrupted too without a legitimate cause. That the alleged defection of the German Reformed Church from the faith of the Heidelberg Catechism, is the real cause, or that the whole Protestant Reformed Dutch Church, or even a majority of it, cordially approve the conduct of those who sundered these

relations with violent hands, we do not believe. We do not believe it, for different reasons. One is found in the official action of the ecclesiastical judicatories of the Dutch Church. In the Spring of 1856, the Classis of Bergen gave one of its most esteemed and faithful middle-aged ministers a regular and honorable dismissal to the Lancaster Classis of the German Reformed Church. He met with a kind reception: and, to the extent that he has become known, his brethren in his new home, repose confidence in the soundness of his faith and in his fidelity to the cause of Christ. In reviewing the proceedings of the Classis of Bergen, the Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, did not censure, but approved this bold step on the part of the lower judicatory. That is to say—judging of this action in the light of preambles and resolutions adopted at a previous meeting—the Synod approves the dismissal of a member, by the Classis of Bergen, to an ecclesiastical body which has forsaken the pure faith of the Reformation, is diligently propagating fatal errors in doctrine and worship, and is pushing forward in the broad road towards papal Rome! The charge of heresy preferred by a certain party, is thus falsified, and put to shame, by the solemn acts of the Classis and Synod of the Dutch Church herself. The contradiction is direct and palpable. It is susceptible, however, of explanation. In a deliberative body, it is possible for a few men comparatively, by artful management, to secure the vote of a majority in favor of a measure which is in conflict with its sober judgment and deepest feelings. But when a suitable occasion offers, and no special object is to be gained, the judgment that really prevails in the body utters itself spontaneously. Hence it was that when a well-tried son of the Dutch Church was willing to pass over into the German Reformed Church, and requested the consent, the approbation and benediction of his brethren, both the Classis and the Synod, with becoming dignity, proceeded on the assumption that all the noise about abominable Romish heresies and corruptions was nothing but a farce.

This *Life of Schlatter* does not, however, possess interest

only for the German Reformed, Lutheran, and Reformed Dutch Churches. It possesses interest also under a much more general view. Schlatter was connected with some of the most important movements of the last century. His life is interwoven with the early history of the Germans, and with the history of Pennsylvania. This memoir represents Schlatter in his relation to these important movements, and to the Germans as a body, irrespective of denominational differences. It must justly be regarded, therefore, as a contribution also to the general history of the times in which Schlatter lived; a contribution that gives us particular facts with their causes and connections, rather than general representations.

Omitting any special notice of the pleasing style in which the *Life of Schlatter* is written, or of the new and excellent translation of Schlatter's Journal, the whole of which has very properly been embodied; we will refer briefly to the important practical bearing of the work.

The Eastern Synod, and the larger portion of the Western Synod, of the German Reformed Church, sustain a relation, at the present day, to the spiritually destitute settlements in Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri and other Western States, like that which the Church of the Palatinate, Switzerland and particularly the Synods of Holland, sustained to the first settlements of Germans in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Virginia one hundred years ago. The fathers and mothers, the sons and daughters of the Church have emigrated to a country where they have no pastors, or but very few, and lack the means of grace; as they did then. Wolves in sheep's clothing are prowling about seeking to devour the sheep; as was the case then. The long, loud, touching cry for the bread of life from famishing thousands, reaches the ears of the Church now; as it did then. But more than this. The position of these Western destitute settlements, is as momentous in its bearings upon the Church of the future, as was the position of the poor weak Pennsylvania churches, in the middle of the last century, in its bearings upon the

Church of the present. And in the strong and influential congregations that now flourish in many parts of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and Ohio, we see what the missionary stations and unorganized settlements of church members will become, under proper culture, in the course of twenty or thirty years hence.

The cases are analagous. So is the work. The *Life and Labors of Michael Schlatter* holds up the work clearly to view which the German Reformed Church is called upon to perform. The same earnestness and devotion are demanded now; the same self-denial and perseverance in the face of disappointments and obstacles; the same liberality from high and low, rich and poor; the same system for calling forth men and money at home; the same plan of operations abroad; and the same man, or a man who possesses the same spirit that inspired the heart, and nerved the arm of Schlatter.

Under this view the *Life of Schlatter* is both a timely and an eminently practical book. We trust it will meet with a warm reception in every section of the Reformed Church. Let ministers and people, old and young, read it—study it. It will send light and warmth into the heart. It will awaken a livelier Church consciousness. It will show us the debt of gratitude we owe to those who lived and toiled before us; and the debt of love and service we owe to our brethren who are perishing for lack of knowledge.

The past is the mirror of the present—the eighteenth, the mirror of the nineteenth century. Let the Church perpetuate her true life; let her cultivate the missionary spirit which pervades every page of *Schlatter's Life*, for it is the spirit of Jesus Christ; let her do what she has done; let her lay her gold, and her sons, on the altar to be consumed in the service of her Lord; and we shall witness greater and more glorious results throughout the West, than those which have followed the labors of Michael Schlatter and his coadjutors in the East.

Lancaster, Pa.

E. V. G.

ART. IX.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

AN ANALYTICAL CONCORDANCE TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; or the Bible presented under classified heads or topics. Edited by *John Eadie*, D. D., LL.D., Prof. of Biblical Literature to the United Presbyterian Church, etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857. (776 pages of three volumes.)

A valuable book of reference for ministers and Bible students generally. It differs from the Common Concordance, whose design is to assist the student in finding some passage of the Bible by means of a leading word; also from the common Scripture Manual or topical Text book which is confined to doctrinal subjects and gives only a part of the Bible. The Analytical Concordance presents the whole Bible distributed under appropriate heads, bringing all the passages which relate to one topic, together under one general head, and then distributing them under subordinate heads. Thus from page 205 to 221, the reader will find all the Bible says on the Family, its divine origin, members, duties, cares, anxieties, parental authority, affection, blessing, nursing, weaning, education, filial duties, domestic prayers, etc.

Eadie's work is based on Matthew Talbot's "Analysis of the Holy Bible, combining the whole of the Old and New Testaments, collected and arranged systematically, in Thirty Books," which appeared at Leeds in 1800. But he increased the general headings from thirty to forty two, and furnished an alphabetical index of contents. Prof. Eadie tells us in the preface, that the Rev. Mr. West's Concordance which appeared in America a few years ago, is but a reprint of Talbot, with a somewhat different arrangement of "Books." But West is at least honest enough to state, in a general way, that his work is based on that of Talbot. But some Englishman by the name of T. Whowell, had the impudence to republish, at London, in 1848, Talbot's Concordance, under a somewhat different title, as his own, with the assurance: "This work has been for many years a labor of love to the Author." As murder will out, so will literary theft, which of all kinds of theft is about the meanest, because it is at the same time a cowardly imposition on the public at large.

P. S.

THE AMERICAN BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY: containing an account of the Lives, Characters, and Writings of the most emi-

nent persons deceased in North America, from its first settlement. By William Allen, D. D., late President of Bowdoin College, etc. Third edition. Boston. John Jewett & Co. 1857.

This is the third edition of a work which the venerable author first published nearly half a century ago. In its present form it is by far the most complete American Biographical Dictionary in existence. It commends itself also by the substantial and elegant style of typography. As the title indicates, it is exclusively devoted to Americans, but embraces also distinguished Europeans like Zinzendorf, Whitefield, Lafayette, Rochambeau, Kosciusko, who spent a part of their life in America, and are more or less connected with our history. It contains on 905 large pages not less than 6,775 American names, six times as many as Appleton's *Cyclopedia*, and three times more than Blake's *Biographical Dictionary*. The author then has evidently aimed at numerical completeness. Many hundreds of his names will hardly be ever looked for, or be found any where else but in this book, except in the local literature and traditions of the Eastern States.

But while Dr. Allen has done full and more than justice to the New England and Puritan department of American Biography, he is evidently far less at home in the history of the Middle and Southern States, and the Presbyterian, Episcopal, and German Churches. He passes by a number of names which were fully as well deserving of a place in his collection as the majority of those which fill his pages. Thus we look in vain for the name of Conrad Weiser, who figured conspicuously as Indian agent in the early history of Pennsylvania, and even of Michael Schlatter, the pioneer missionary of the German Reformed Church of North America, whose eminently useful life has been recently reproduced in a highly interesting volume of the Rev. H. Harbaugh (*Schlatter's Life and Labors*, Phila., 1857). Dr. Rauch is noticed, but simply and hardly accurately, as "minister at Mercersburg, Pa., died March 2, 1841," and not a word is said of Marshall College, of which he was the first President, and of his work on *Psychology*, on which his literary reputation chiefly rests.

The book, then, might be greatly improved, if some obscure ministers and schoolmasters of New England were left out, to make room for eminent names from other sections of the country. It is defective also in point of critical discernment, exact proportion, accurate delineation and pregnant condensation of style, which, in our estimation, are even of greater importance than numerical completeness. But of all works a biographical dictionary can least be expected to be perfect, especially one which refers to a new and less cultivated department of history. Dr. Allen deserves great credit for his literary in-

dustry, long continued perseverance, general accuracy in the statement of facts, and the pious spirit which runs through his work, which will not soon be superseded by a better one, and prove a valuable book of reference to the student of American history.
P. S.

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE : viewed in connection with the entire scheme of the Divine Dispensations. By Patrick Fairbairn, D. D., Prof. of Divinity, Free Church College, Glasgow. Third edition, in two volumes. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1857.

This standard work, on the important subject of which it treats, has been noticed at length by Dr. J. W. N., in a previous volume of this Review (1852), so that it is merely necessary to direct attention to the appearance of the third edition, which can be had at the cheap and substantial book store of Smith & English, in Sixth Street below Arch, Philadelphia.
P. S.

THE TWO PILGRIMS : or the Israelite and the Christian on their Journey to the Earthly and the Heavenly Canaan. By Rev. F. R. Anspach, A. M., author of "Sepulchres of our Departed," etc. For the Lutheran Board of Publication. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1857. pp. 399.

The New Testament is infolded in the Old; and the Old Testament is unfolded in the New. Thus already Augustine taught. They are integral parts of one whole: the one containing the germ of eternal life in the promise, the other, the ripe fruit in the person of the Word made flesh. God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in His Son. 1 John 5: 11. Hence the historical facts of the Old Testament do not only serve as convenient figures of speech for the truth of the New; but they are also the proper types of the Gospel. They represent, under a definite form, the great idea which is brought out in its fullness, in the last stages of the development of grace.

The Two Pilgrims lays hold of this profound idea, and turns it to account in a popular way. It follows the Israelite from the house of bondage through the wilderness to the Goodly Land; and illustrates the spiritual pilgrimage of the believers from a state of sin to the Heavenly Canaan. The parallel is generally drawn truthfully and forcibly. We should differ, for example, from Mr. Anspach in his view of the prototype of Moses. According to the general idea of the book, Moses the divinely commissioned deliverer of the Israelites, is not the type of a minister of Christ, but of Jesus Christ Himself, the true deliverer of his spiritual Israel from the bondage of sin. The style is easy, pleasant, and often graphic and eloquent, yet at times deficient in simplicity and rhetorical consistency. The book will be read with profit. We give it our best wishes.

E. V. G

THE DIVINE LIBRARY; OR CYCLOPEDIA OF INSPIRATION. The Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, according to St. Matthew. Revised version in paragraph form. Baltimore: T. H. Stockton, No. 68, Lexington St. 1856.

A tract for time and for eternity from the pen of one who wrote as he was moved by the Holy Ghost.

The idea of publishing the books of the Old and New Testaments in separate volumes is as old as it is new: new in modern times, but old as the Sacred Scriptures themselves. For as every one knows, the sacred books were originally published at different times and places; and were handed down for centuries as separate productions. The plan of publishing all the books of the Sacred Scriptures in a single volume, is of comparatively recent origin, and a human expedient. But it is certainly very wise, being connected with innumerable advantages, and will never, as it ought not to be, abandoned. Yet the original mode should not be set aside by human wisdom. The greatest advantages will be derived to the Church and the world by publishing the Scriptures in both ways. Let the Word of God go forth as a compact whole, and in its separate parts in all languages to the ends of the earth.

We have long felt the necessity and propriety of Mr. Stockton's plan; and we can heartily bid God-speed to the undertaking in which he has embarked.

E. V. G.

AN APOLOGY FOR THE COMMON ENGLISH BIBLE; and a Review of the Extraordinary Changes made in it by Managers of the American Bible Society. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson. pp. 67.

The American Bible Society was instituted to print and circulate the Bible without note or comment. So far as the English tongue is concerned, its original design was to publish the English Bible according to King James' translation. It was not instituted to make a *new* translation, or to *revise* the *old* one. Revision is in place by the American Bible Society in as far as it regards the *English text*. We must have a *correct* edition, most certainly. Who so simple as to intimate that the Bible Society must reprint the errors and blunders that have crept into the English Bible? But to revise the English *text* in order to publish a correct edition of the received translation, and to revise the English *translation* in order to make changes in punctuation and language affecting the sense, are very plainly two totally different things. The one is its chief duty, whilst the other is a direct violation of its trust.

Such a violation of trust the author of the *Apology* for the Common English Bible, Rev. A. Cleveland Cox of Baltimore, charges upon the American Bible Society; and he has, in our

judgment, fully sustained the charge. The summaries which were prefixed to the chapters, and the headings set along the top of the pages, in the common English Bible, have been eliminated by the Society in its late Revised or Standard Edition; and new summaries and new headings introduced. This is publishing the Bible *with* note and comment—note and comment *of its own*. Changes have also been made in punctuation, altering the sense in at least *four* instances, for which there is no authority in any edition. This is revising the *translation* instead of the English text.

The question is not, now, whether the new summaries and headings are better or worse than the old ones; or whether the changes affecting the sense are few or many, judicious or not. The real question is: Has the American Bible Society made *any* changes? Has it deliberately deviated from a correct edition of the authorized translation? For the *principle* involved is the same whether the changes be good or bad; whether but one or one thousand. If the managers are at liberty to make one change in the text on what may seem to them to be sufficient grounds, they may for the same reasons make any number of changes.

If, however, the Society claims the right to lay down this principle, and act on it, let it be known. Let the American Churches know, that the Society, though organized and sustained to publish a correct edition of the authorized version, without note or comment, claims the right in fact though not professedly, to revise the authorized translation and introduce important modifications which are to be found in no edition. Let it be known in its real character.

Whether the English version—the best undoubtedly that has yet been made—has any blemishes or not; whether susceptible of improvement, or whether a revision of it ought to be undertaken in the right way, is an entirely different question, and one that we can not now touch.

H. V. G.

THE SCRIPTURAL ERA IN MODERN HISTORY; or, The Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century, the Product of Spiritual Despotism. By T. M. Post. New York: Charles Scribner, 1866.

A vigorous, well written book. It appears to have been originally delivered in the form of lectures; and we can easily conceive that, with an effective delivery, its well turned periods, its vivid and often novel illustrations, its close and pointed statements, its graphic sketches of men and times, and its fearlessness, and sometimes almost startling independence of thought, would fall upon a popular audience with no common power. The vein of discussion is somewhat original. It has been common to charge upon Protestantism the infidelity which succeeded the Reformation, and it has been common also to accede to

the charge, and to endeavor to palliate the fact as one of the unavoidable excesses of the freedom accorded by Protestantism to private judgment. Mr. Post takes up a new line of investigation, and endeavors to meet the issue from a different point. He finds the radical source, the *causa causans* of the revolt of the human mind against Christianity in the eighteenth century, in the opposite principle of ecclesiastical and political despotism. In Protestantism and its influence, direct and indirect, upon Europe, he finds merely the occasion or channel through which this cause wrought itself out. He charges upon despotism, spiritual and civil, that it thwarted, perverted and led partially astray, a necessary and beneficent step in the legitimate progress of humanity. In making out this issue, he appears to have sifted with considerable care the history of Europe from the Middle Ages onward, and to have exercised the discrimination of a careful and capable thinker, in distinguishing between that which was causal, and that which was accidental, in the production of results.

He analyzes the relaxed and exhausted condition of Europe at the close of the thirty years' war, and the consequent partial dethronement of the religious idea from the seat of its outward supremacy over the nations. He then investigates the revolution in philosophy which the age,—not Protestantism merely—demanded and accomplished. Also the effects of the rise of the idea of wealth to the ascendancy in European society. These he treats as proximate or incidental occasions in the production of the subsequent infidel era. He then examines the specific operation, in their agencies and results, of the despotisms of Europe as working upon and against these movements of the age, and pledging Christianity alike to a false science, a false authority, a false view of human life, and identified it with moral corruption in Church and State—thus necessitating, *so far forth*, the revolt of the human mind against it. Throughout the whole course of his argument he keeps constantly before the mind of the reader, by way of example or illustration, the French nation as the most powerful generator and diffuser of infidelity, and, at the same time, the theatre of the most potent exertions of politico-ecclesiastical, and ecclesiastico-political despotism. In conclusion, he glances at the history and condition of Italy and Spain, which he anticipates might be adduced as vitiating his theory, and endeavors to show that there despotism crushed out infidelity, only because it crushed out an already ebbing vigor and life, leaving only stagnations, mental and spiritual atrophy and death.

There is just one important exception which we take to the book. It is characterized throughout by one detraction vice, which indeed is a common vice of all polemic deliverances *coram populo*, viz: the vice of *over-statement*. Mr. Post's fervor

of imagination, and his eagerness to state a case as strongly as possible for the purposes of his argument, often lead him to over-state it, and hence he fails to command the confidence of the critical reader. We feel, indeed, during the perusal of every chapter, that we are listening to the lecturer rather than the calm interpreter of history. The book bears throughout too much the air of special pleading. He over-states the extent and character of the infidelity of which his book treats. He over-states the worthlessness of the speculative philosophy of the Middle Ages. He often over-states both the virtues and the vices of personal character. And he greatly over-states the moral and intellectual sins and foibles of that Church, which he sets before his reader as the highest impersonation of spiritual despotism. Nevertheless, he has given us a highly readable book, and one on whose pages gleam many weighty truths and striking thoughts.

C.

THE DESERT OF SINAI: Notes of a Spring Journey from Cairo to Beersheba. By Horatius Bonar, D. D. Kelso. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1857.

We have here a pleasant specimen of a kind of literature which is becoming abundant just in proportion as men are disposed to "run to and fro," and knowledge becomes increased. The passion for travel is one of the features of the times: and when a man has gone abroad and sees so much that thousands of those he left behind can never see, he can hardly be expected to resist the temptation to write a book. The book before us is strictly what it pretends to be, that is, "Notes of a Journey," or a running record of observations and reflections made at the time, during a five months tour with a brother clergyman and two friends in the East. The substance of most of the notes, he tells us, was written "on the back of the camel," an exercise "which a little practice made easy, at least when the animal was not moving at more than its common rate of two miles and a quarter an hour." Of course, in these circumstances, we are not to look for anything very scientific, philosophical or profound, but we have a pleasant and racy sketch of what was seen by the eye and heard by the ear. Some happy illustrations of Scripture passages are given, and a scale of the heights of the desert mountains.

C.